

(Proceedings commence at 1:02 p.m.)

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Okay. We are ready with the livestream. That's why we had to have a little down time here.

Good afternoon. I'm Justice Hantz Marconi, an associate justice here at the Supreme Court, chair of the court's Task Force on Domestic Violence Cases in the Judicial System.

Today, the task force is holding a public hearing to help us in our review of the subjects the court has asked it to review, which include practices in the Superior and Circuit Court procedure in domestic violence cases and resources needed to better support domestic violence victims, the current status of New Hampshire law regarding domestic violence, criteria for making appellate decisions related to domestic violence and civil stalking protective orders available to the public, court forms related to domestic violence, increasing access for domestic violence victims to legal counsel and victim advocates, the current state of relationships between the courts, law enforcement, criminal defense attorneys, domestic violence advocates, and steps to improve communication, and any other relevant subject.

We look forward to your input. Joining me are members of the task force and its working group. A complete list of those members is available on the Judicial Branch



website. This public hearing is being livestreamed on the Judicial Branch's website, and recording -- a recording will be uploaded to the website.

We hope that this meeting will allow us to hear directly from a broad spectrum of people. As our time is limited, we expect each participant to couch your remarks and be aware of time, but we're not going to put a specific time limit on you. If you do not get an opportunity to speak or choose not to, there are comment sheets in back for you to fill out, which will be collected at the end of the hearing.

You're also encouraged to email or send mail via post office, with your comments, to the task force.

Information about how to do so is on our website and also in a handout at the back, in the court lobby.

In addition, starting next week through the end of the month, we will have a court information call center, toll-free number. It's a standard toll-free number, 855-212-1234. That will be available Monday through Friday, 8 to 4, to receive calls and allow for a call-back from a task force member. Detailed instructions on how to reach the task force by using the call-in number is also included on the form available in the court lobby.

So those are the preliminaries. We will now proceed with the hearing. I will call on people to come up to the microphone and speak in the order in which they signed up.



UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where is it now?

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Oh, sorry. The sign-up sheets were out front with the security. And we will be circulating pick-up or sign-up sheets as the afternoon progresses.

So I have Dr. Rhonda Hodge first on my list.

DR. HODGE: Hi. Thank you so much. So my name's

Dr. Rhonda Hodge, and I own one of the largest psychiatric

practices in Salem, New Hampshire. I treat all patients from
all over New Hampshire.

This has definitely been something that I have been trying to be as diligent as possible with what's been going on in the State of New Hampshire; make the bold statement that I no longer feel comfortable with patients coming to me (audio interference) in domestic violence situations. I no -- I no longer feel comfortable actually having them leave their relationship. It's a super scary thing for me to say as a provider.

The protocols, the things that are in place, they don't make sense for the reality of what domestic violence looks like. We're constantly putting kids in really dangerous situations. One of the pieces that I've been working on and kind of putting together is that I also find it not fair what we do to our judges and what we do to the Supreme Court.

There is no way that I can expect the judges in New



Hampshire or the judges, you know, nationally to know what complex PTSD looks like, to know what it feels like to be a victim, to know that -- what narcissistic personality disorder looks like. You have these facts come before you that are not in your wheelhouse. There's no way. You're not trained in developmental psychology or developmental medicine or pediatric medicine.

And I constantly have these people that will go to the court, like, no, let's do it. We'll go to the court.

We're going to keep you safe. I really trusted, in the first 20 years of my career, that the states keep people safe. It's just not true, and I don't think it's for any other reason. I mean, I do feel like people do the best that they can, and the judges are doing the best that they can with what they have.

And now we have lots of imagery all over all of these websites of all of these judges who are really good people, but they're being blamed for making these really difficult decisions that they're just not trained to be able to make.

With boots on the ground, I'm seeing it all the time. I'm seeing kids going back to abusive families because -- it's usually Mom, but it is dads too, right?

Dads -- there are -- you know, abuse goes both ways, but it is predominantly female, going back to these situations that I know, in my heart and my soul, they're being abused. The



GA -- or they're being manipulated, based on whatever is going on to continue to abuse Mom. And I have to support it.

And we've had so many cases throughout the state that I don't want, you know, to fully, like, alarm people, but we've seen -- I have been to court with people where there's a service weapon being used and being threatened for Mom and child. There's no -- like, there's no supervised visits.

There's no, like, nothing. The protocols just don't -- I don't know if they don't work. They don't make sense for what the reality of the situation is.

I have situations where I've taken some patients to the police station for -- in one case, and I -- I did get permission to speak about it, the ex-boyfriend was actually digging graves for the family in the back yard and just walking -- and then walking into the home he was not supposed to be at, that he had some -- he was actually a doctor, and he had some psychiatric things going on. But they're not kept safe. The restraining order was not supported.

He was digging graves in their back yard and then putting on Instagram pictures of some Satanic something. Not supported, so she had to move. And when you move, if you do have -- like, if you do have the financial means to move, which a lot of people don't, your new address is still made public. Any sort of real estate transaction's public. I mean, there are so many little things that if you don't know,

you don't know.

And there is a -- I mean, there is a program, right, where we can keep -- throughout the State of New Hampshire, where you can keep your residence -- you can use it -- I -- I forget what it's called, the address confidentiality. But it doesn't work if you are somebody who can buy a house. It doesn't work if you are somebody who needs to put your kid in school. It doesn't work. There's so many loopholes to that. So it's a very small population that that works for.

And if somebody's going to stalk you, they're going to stalk you. It's not going to be -- it's not going to be something, like I said, essentially, that will work, I mean, with all the public information.

I was speaking last week at the State House, and I don't even know how many people know about the devices that are being used now. You guys know, like, you can find your Apple Watch, like, your Apple -- those little Apple things that are just being stuck in people's cars. I have -- oftentimes, I have to hide patients' phones because they will leave, and their abuser will call, and they know everything we just talked about.

Seeing me as a psychiatric provider, I do primary -primary care as well, but speaking mostly from my psychiatric
background, that's being used against people. So they're
being abused. They have PTSD. And then it's being brought up

in family court that they're crazy, and they lose some rights to their children.

It's -- I am offering all of my extra time, which I don't have a lot of. I don't know if you guys know there's a mental health crisis going on right now in New Hampshire. But I would volunteer all of my time to help make this better. I love New Hampshire. I love my state. This is where I'm from. This is where I was educated. I just want to be able to have a person come into my office, me be able to take their hand and say, I trust that the state is going to do the right thing to the best of their ability. So that's why I'm here today.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you.

DR. HODGE: Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Alan Cronheim.

MR. CRONHEIM: Good afternoon. My name is Alan

Cronheim, and I'm a lawyer in Portsmouth. I am here today on

behalf of the New Hampshire Association of Criminal Defense

Lawyers. While we are criminal defense lawyers, a great

number of us, myself included, handle restraining order cases

on behalf of both plaintiffs and defendants.

I want to start by thanking you for your work. It is both important and it is difficult. It's important because we know that domestic violence and intimate partner violence is real and is, unfortunately, a problem in all of our communities.



I also know that your job is difficult. I was on the first District Court domestic violence protocol committee as a representative of A Safe Place, now HAVEN, that provided New Hampshire's first shelter for victims of batter -- domestic violence. I was also on the committee that updated and revised those protocols at the behest of Judge Kelly. So I know that there are complex and competing issues as you create public policy.

I've been able to work with a number of you on the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Committee, so I also know your commitment to these issues and, in my view, the challenges to provide relief for those who are at risk, while honoring fairness to the parties and due process.

I've listened to one of your meetings, the January 12th meeting, and would like to just quickly address some of the things that came up during that meeting. A first and easy is we fully support the distribution of court decisions that inform litigants, advocates, and attorneys as to the state of the law.

Next, focusing on sentencing in criminal cases, an issue came up about criminal jurisdiction concluding after a period of time and what to do for people who were still impacted by the victimization which was part of their criminal process.

I've handled a number of restraining order cases



filed in the Superior Court, a court with full jurisdiction to enter protective orders. I don't see Dave (phonetic)

Vicinanzo here today, but I was going to make the comment that for his 21-year-old client -- you may have remembered he referenced her being at church with her abuser. He can go to Superior Court and get a permanent restraining order.

So it's not a situation -- and it -- and the restraining order process is one endorsed by the Supreme Court, so we know that it is a doable, functional process under the law, approved by our State Supreme Court.

I don't know if this committee is going to address the issue that I think Judge Yazinski raised about the open question as to whether final hearings have to be held within 30 days of the filing of a protective order petition. To the extent you do -- and there is value to it if there is dispute within the District Court judges, the Family Court judges as to how to handle it -- I would strongly encourage you to recommend that temporary orders can be extended with consent of both parties. So defendant has a right to a hearing within 30 days, but the parties, if they mutually agree, can extend the temporary order.

In representing plaintiffs and defendants, but in truth, mostly plaintiffs, I've had temporary orders extended 3, 6, 9, even 12 months, with the understanding that final hearing on the original petition can be heard if the defendant

violates those temporary orders.

My experience representing plaintiffs is that the great majority want a guarantee that the order remains in place and that they are protected. And most, in truth, are anxious about testifying. It's in public. It's subject to cross-examination, and it's about events which create trauma in their lives. So if there is a way of getting that protection without the need for a full court hearing, my clients, as plaintiffs, have joined that approach with appreciation.

I was recently involved in a case where we extended a temporary order for 12 months, the full relief that we could get at a final hearing. But my client, who was, at the time, shaking and scared, she didn't have to testify. So she got the result she wanted. The defendant, who had immigration issues, got a result that was of value to him because there was no final order that was entered.

If the 30-day extension period is not allowed, my client would have had to go through what I think would itself have been a difficult process of testifying in court, facing her abuser, and being subjected to cross-examination.

In all of the cases where I've used the three, six, and nine-month extensions, every one of those cases, it's worked. Never had somebody violate it, and I never have to come back a second time for what would have been a final

hearing. My experience is that with that break in time, there can frequently -- not in every instance, but frequently be a separation of the relationship, and those folks can move forward.

The last issue I want to address is our concern about the expansion of the kinds of cases that could be covered by the domestic violence statute. Under current law, protective orders can be issued with the showing of criminal conduct and where there's a credible present threat to the petitioner's safety.

We think that this is a workable and an appropriate standard for court intervention and the granting of judicial relief. There was a discussion in your earlier meeting that dated conduct was not in some way relevant to the court's consideration in determining whether to issue a protective order. Attorney Vicinanzo mentioned (audio interference) bullets.

The dated -- the admissibility of dated evidence is allowed. It's simply not true that dated conduct is not relevant to the court's consideration. RSA 173-B:1, in defining abuse, specifically provides that the court may consider evidence of acts, regardless of their proximity in time to the filing of the petition, and that past acts can be combined with recent conduct to demonstrate an ongoing pattern of behavior which reasonably causes or has caused the

petitioner to fear for their safety or well-being.

The requirement of proof of a crime creates a standard that courts use every day and contains elements that allow a court to avoid subjective judgments of harm. If the definition of abuse is expanded based on anecdotal evidence to include offensive conduct -- Judge Yazinski mentioned yelling at the petitioner -- there is all sorts of offensive conduct which, sadly, we are aware of.

If that -- if it -- the standard is offensive conduct that is not defined, the court will be applying a standard that does not include a universal definition or a definition that can be applied judge-to-judge in a consistent way.

It's our view that the domestic violence statute, combined with the stalking statute and protective orders that are available as part of divorce proceedings, appropriately protect victims. It is not a system that is failing, but instead, one that, by and large, works, not perfectly but works.

It's also our view that any systemic changes in the law should be informed not simply by anecdotal evidence but by data that provides information about the system as a whole.

How many emergency petitions are filed but denied? How many petitions are denied temporary relief? How many are temporary orders issued, but there's no request for permanent relief

through a final order? How many petitions are denied, and sadly, based on the case that led to this -- the creation of this committee, how many criminal cases follow the denial of protective orders?

There is a whole set of other anecdotes that this committee will not likely hear or be the subject of other testimony. It is the whispered part of this issue, difficult for me to discuss because so much of my time has been advocating for plaintiffs and victims of domestic abuse. But I know this to be true.

And it's the whispered part of this issue, the times mutual contact follows the issuance of orders because plaintiffs are not, in the end, in fear of the defendant, times petitioners have used the protective order statutes for advantage in the family court, to obtain use of an apartment or a home, or to gain advantage in parenting issues. We would like to think that those kinds of things do not occur. But from bailiffs to court clerks to private conversations with judges, we know that to be true.

There are times attorneys have sent their clients pro se to get temporary orders that are then used for the advantage in divorce proceedings to follow. But do these anecdotes mean that these statutes should be narrowed? No, of course not. Just as there is no epidemic of improperly granted orders, I do not think there is an epidemic of cases

where orders were improperly denied.

To the suggestion of one of your members that the courts have narrowed scope of these statutes, I haven't seen it, nor have I heard it from conversations with family court practitioners or quardians ad litem.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, your work is important. It is my view that it is best approached with real data and not (audio interference) of anecdotes from either plaintiffs or defendants. In the end, I hope your work is accomplished using -- with what Justice Hantz Marconi characterized as a balancing act, and at the words of the order creating this committee, in accordance with the principles of equal justice for all. Thank you.

I do want to throw -- can I respond to the doctor who just testified?

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Sure.

MR. CRONHEIM: Thank you. I wasn't prepared to discuss this because I had limited time. I think one of the great failings of our court system is the focus on kids. We know, in ways that we didn't, perhaps, 20 or 30 years ago, that domestic violence impacts kids. We also know, on the other side, that when temporary orders are issued, there is a likelihood of no contact between the defendant in the case and those children.

This is part of the balancing act that I think is



difficult, to protect children but not to impact relationships between parents and kids. And our system doesn't spend enough time and enough money on kids, focusing on their needs.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you.

Kathryn Jones.

MS. JONES: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to share my (audio interference) today.

Jersey to become a permanent citizen of the State of New
Hampshire. And I did so for the safety of myself and for the
well-being of my then-infant daughter. And at the time, New
Hampshire gave me exactly what I needed for both of us. They
gave us, first, a restraining order. And finally, they gave
me full physical and legal custody of my daughter.

Now, what's kind of unique about my case was that my perpetrator was not my daughter's biological father. But the state that I came from said that because he was the only father she ever knew, he had right to her. And so began a six-year odyssey of trying to find permanent protection for myself and my daughter. We succeeded.

30 years later, I am a justice advocate for victims of domestic violence, primarily for protective mothers who are trying to keep their children safe through the family court and child protection systems. To say that the family court is failing these families is a massive understatement.

I just learned about this hearing last night. And so I've been up until 3:00 in the morning, trying to prepare my notes on everything I want to say. There is entirely too much to be said in respect to you folks, as well as the people who are waiting to testify here. But if I could share with you just a handful of the massive ways that the family courts are currently failing all families where they are targeted by perpetrators of domestic violence, I would like the opportunity to do so.

One case that I dealt with that was particularly horrific was a mom who was English illiterate, who was representing herself through the family court in the southern half of the state. This mother had access to local domestic violence crisis services. She had been given access to legal services, initially. But ultimately, because of her -- her lack of English-speaking capability, these programs found it very difficult, if not impossible, to work with her.

This mother was representing herself, family court system, by speaking her broke English into Google translation, cutting and pasting her words into motions, and then submitting these documents to the court. And because she came from a country where a double negative means that something is really bad, as opposed to our English where double negative is something that's good, she was repeatedly misinterpreted and accused of lying.

At one point, the guardian ad litem assigned to this case told the court that this mother was fully capable of reading and understanding all court orders that were issued from the court, which was absolutely 100 percent false. And when I approached this guardian ad litem to ask her to be able to interpret the court orders for this mother, the guardian ad litem absolutely refused to work with me because she didn't like it that there was somebody watching over her shoulder.

This guardian ad litem submitted motions to court, threatening the mother with jail time for the fact that this mother could not pay her. And in fact, I had to, in the fairness of justice, find an attorney that I paid for from my own money, from my own personal money, so this mother would have an attorney represent her in court. And so -- and I approached my church to cover the guardian ad litem funds so this mother wouldn't face jail time.

Now, the father in this case was convicted of human trafficking out of U.S. District Court in Connecticut. And this father had trafficked this mother and had forced a pregnancy on her, and that's how this child came to be. And this guardian ad litem recommended full physical and legal custody to the predator. And the only reason that the court didn't grant it was because the child would have been devastated by separation with the caretaking mother.

But the only thing that finally and permanently



separated that child from this predator was the fact that this child was forced into contact with the predator, who was in a car accident where the child had to suffer a traumatic brain injury in order to be finally freed from this predator.

In the same town that I live in, there is a convicted rapist who has full physical and legal custody of his three daughters, even though he was convicted of raping his ex-wife and her daughter.

I routinely tell women now that if they're in the family court system, they are in the family court system until the day their youngest child turns 18. I have clients that I've been working with for over 20 years in this family court system.

I say this with great frustration and disappointment because as an advocate, when I first heard about the family court system and, you know, the -- the -- the pilot project that was going to be the family court, I was so excited about the concept that there would be one judge who would overlook the criminal aspect and the child protection aspect and everything that legally related to any one family, and that because they had that kind of birds-eye view of what was going on, that they would be able to make appropriate orders when it came to family court.

And from personal experience, I had seen that New Hampshire had the capacity to do that. They are failing



routinely. Of the -- in any given month, I can be working up to 275, sometimes 300 women, not just in New Hampshire now -- I'm a national-known advocate -- but primarily in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. And fully anywhere from 59 to 64 percent of the mothers that I work with have at least one child who is actively suicidal, wishing to die, wanting to die.

Another 85 percent of the total number of mothers I work with have at least one child who is special needs: autistic, ADD, ADHD, ODD. So for me, there is a high correlation -- I am not the doctor who can study all of that, but there's a high correlation between special-needs children and domestic violence. And it's a particular area that the family courts are not equipped to address at all.

Up to 95 percent of the women I work with have significant mental health diagnoses, but I would tell you that they were -- are also likely misdiagnosed. Many of the survivors that I work with have been diagnosed with bipolar or with borderline personality disorder or nonspecific personality disorder, when in fact, they're trauma victims, and all they need is safety from their predator in order to stop -- in -- in order to be able to find peace and be able to recover and heal from their trauma.

And I would tell you, lastly, that 100 percent of these victims feel revictimized and traumatized by the family



court process itself, 100 percent of them. Most of them should be qualified for ADA accommodations through the family court. I have seen victims repeatedly request them and be denied them. For those ones that have been granted ADA accommodations, they have to go back and fight for them every single time there's a change in judges.

I've seen one family who's had seven different judges. This is unsustainable for the survivors that I work with. And as an unfunded program, I receive no funding. I ask for no money from any of the survivors that I work with. I am a one-woman, 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week crisis line. This is not sustainable. These families need help. And the one thing that I love about New Hampshire is that we're small enough that we can create really significant change for these families if we put our hearts and minds into it.

I don't agree -- even though I know Attorney

Cronheim and was part of the domestic violence program that he has provided services for in the past, I don't agree that victims go in to get a leg up on -- on divorce cases. And in fact, in my experience, as soon as a woman claims publicly that she's a victim of domestic violence, she's immediately put under a microscope and denied and disbelieved.

One time, I created a Clothesline T-shirt for the Clothesline T-shirt Project that said, as long as I kept the

secret, I was just a battered woman. Once I told the truth, I was a bitter, violent, lying, lazy, crazy, drunken, (audio interference), money-grubbing slut. He said it. The court believed it. That settled it.

And I can tell you that every single victim that I work with, when they see that t-shirt on my website, they're going, yep, that's exactly what's happened to me.

This can't happen. It's got to change. And the one thing that I would look back and say, gosh, if we made one wrong turn in all of this, many, many years ago, judges were -- I don't know if it was a requirement or that they were asked to create family violence councils where they brought together the best of the best of the local community services, child protection, mental health, police, domestic violence crisis centers. And judges were required to be a part of those councils themselves. And there was collaborative effort, and there was training and education going on.

And then at some point in time, it's decided that with the judges heading these councils, it created an implicit bias, that, you know, they would automatically be for victims of domestic violence. We -- we couldn't have that. So judges started walking away from those councils. And when judges started walking away, so did police departments, and so did child protection. And ultimately, it's domestic violence crisis centers that were left holding those bags.

I can see the family violence councils as potentially being a renewing resource that would actually be available to support local judges, that could potentially review domestic violence-related cases, those high-conflict cases that every judge dreads, to be able to review the cases and to be able to make recommendations on the basis of what they're seeing in these court files.

I have so much more to say, but it's not fair to the others, so I appreciate your time. And I will be submitting more in email testimony. Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Feel free. Thank you very much, but feel free to submit anything that's in writing.

MS. JONES: Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Great. Thank you.

Dana Albrecht.

MR. ALBRECHT: Good afternoon, Your Honor and members of the committee. For the record, my name is Dana Albrecht, and I'm a resident of Nashua, New Hampshire.

First, a brief background for context on my own DV case and Supreme Court appeal, and then I'll speak to the particulars with regard to some of the seven subjects under consideration by this task force.

I've never committed a violent act in my life, nor even been arrested prior to my family law case starting in April 2016. I'm a peaceful person, and I'm a father of four

wonderful children. I've been in Nashua Family Court over five years, starting with a six-month DV issued against me by former Judge Paul S. Moore, which required that I had to attend an independent fundamentalist Baptist church, located in Dracut, Massachusetts, three times a week in order to see my three minor children under supervised visitation by church leadership, until it was finally dismissed when I got a hearing six months later.

The only justification for that initial order, issued ex parte, was that Mom and I had both read each other's email as the marriage broke down at the very end. It's not hard to do that when people know each other's passwords. And I have to ask if that's domestic violence.

I've also had false criminal charges against me for trespass and invasion of privacy because I showed up at our marital home, pursuant to a written agreement between both our attorneys for me to do so, with a real estate agent present to do a walk-through of the marital home. That went to trial too, and that got thrown out.

Most recently, I've had a second DV against me, issued by Judge Mark S. Derby, which, instead of requiring me to attend the Massachusetts IFB church like Paul Moore did, now prohibits me from going within 2,000 feet of it, even though the other party, formerly a resident of California when she filed the action, is now a resident of East China,

Michigan.

So that basically came about because on the day,

November 3rd, Sunday service in November 2019, I wanted to see

my kids. So I was sitting quietly, alone in a church pew,

public service, hoping to see my kids. IFB church leader did

not agree with that. They've kind of taken sides in the

underlying divorce and told me I had to leave, but I could

come back on a different day if I wanted to listen to a

sermon.

So I guess I made the mistake of disagreeing with that, and Judge Derby wrote an order to -- essentially, my position, to protect the IFB church. It's been on appeal twice up to the New Hampshire Supreme Court, you know, docket 2021-0192.

So I have to ask, sitting quietly, peacefully, alone in a public church service, domestic violence, the finding of abuse based solely on events of a single day, when there's no contact whatsoever with the other party that day.

I just have to say I've had a bad experience with the Nashua Family Court, you know, having started out with my very first DV order by Paul Moore, having Julie Introcaso appoint her best friend, Kathleen Sternenberg, as guardian ad litem in my divorce case, and most recently, having Marital Master Bruce DalPra say, who gives an F, concerning my testimony, and calling my kids a bunch of morons. You can

read all about that in the "New Hampshire Union Leader". But suffice it to say that I've kind of completely lost confidence in the New Hampshire judicial system.

Sort of this final background, I'd also like to say that my heart goes out to all of victims, sort of what I -- real domestic violence out there, especially the recent shooting tragedy in -- tragedy in Massachusetts. But I also believe, kind of looking at the past work of this committee, that some of the statistics on how many orders get granted, how many get denied are missing the point.

I think we need statistics on how often our courts make mistakes and (audio interference) fail utterly at doing their job. Our goal should be that in cases of real, legitimate domestic violence, 100 percent of those orders get granted, and in cases of false accusations, 0 percent of those orders get granted. Just make the right decision. That's the gold standard. I mean, granted, nobody's perfect and we all fall short, but that's what we should be aiming for.

And with that background, I'd now like to speak more directly to some of the seven subjects under consideration by the task force.

So with regard to item 3 -- and I may hop around a bit here -- making appellate decisions available to the public, why isn't my appellate decision on the Judicial Branch website? It's actually pretty easy to find on the internet,

but it's published by the "New Hampshire Union Leader" on their website. You can Google it. But it's not on yours. It suppose you could go next door and go over the whole docket, you know, again, 2021-0192, at the law library if you want. But why isn't it out there?

With regard to item 4 on court forms, I have to ask why we can't design a court form for, say, a pro se victim with no legal training, where they get to check some boxes specifying exactly which parts of which statutes the defendant is alleged to have violated, with some blank space for the plaintiff to fill in any events or facts alleged to be in violation of the statute. I mean, I think that would sure simplify proceedings when all parties know exactly what's before the trial court, if there's a hearing.

I'm disturbed that Judge Derby told me that plaintiffs, in their domestic violence petitions, are not required to identify by name and citation which crimes in RSA 173-B:1 the defendant has committed. He says, the defendant and the court discern it from the facts that the plaintiff pleads. And that is what happened here. And I know he used the words "crimes". And you know, that kind of blurs the distinction between kind of what's a civil and criminal action, in my mind. Just something to think about.

And I still don't have any specifics on which crimes -- and again, that's the word that was used in my



order -- I'm alleged to have committed while sitting alone in a church pew in an entirely different state from where the party resides. How am I supposed to discern that? So we need to fix that.

And it's -- I'm actually going to say it's even more important for the victims so the court can get right to the point and not waste judicial resources on anything that's irrelevant. Wasting judicial resources leads to overworked judges and bad decisions.

With regard to item 5 on increasing access to counsel, I'm concerned about that. It says increasing access to counsel for only plaintiffs. And especially as they called what I did crimes, how does this not run afoul of the Equal Protection Clause and the Sixth Amendment to the Federal Constitution? I have to say, from my perspective, it's a complete reversal of all traditional American jurisprudence. And I have to say I'd almost rather be accused of first-degree murder than domestic violence, because at least then, if I'm completely innocent and I just didn't do it, period, I have the right to an attorney, you know, Gideon v. Wainwright, 1963.

I'm kind of going back to item 2 on your list. Both my case and kind of the case that Judge Hall decided that started this whole thing both involved events in Massachusetts. So I'm a multi-state, diversity-of-citizenship

family law case that's involving New Hampshire, Massachusetts, California, and now Michigan. And so I think we need to look more into how we're handling jurisdiction (audio interference), particularly in light of the federal Violence Against Women Act also being kind of controlling federal law. So it's not just about New Hampshire, per se.

These cases can involve fundamental Constitutional rights; again, can, under the First, Second, and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. And those should be subject to strict scrutiny review. I think we'd be here all day if I discussed case law on the First and Fourteenth Amendments. You can --

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Don't have time for that.

MR. ALBRECHT: Don't have time for that.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: No.

MR. ALBRECHT: But I point out, the Second

Amendment, I think, is particularly relevant just as a topic
in DV cases. And we've got <u>District of Columbia v. Heller</u>
from 2008 and its progeny to contend with. And not to mention
the <u>New York Rifle & Pistol</u> case that's currently pending
before the U.S. Supreme Court up in D.C. That's docket 20-

I also think that federal case law on vagueness is pretty relevant here, and I kind of put all that in my appellate brief.

Finally, with regard to both kind of item 7 and including item 4, I'd like to ask if there'd been any inquiry by this task force into how many DV cases there have been where a plaintiff has ever been prosecuted in any capacity for providing false and malicious information on their D forms -- DV forms. So that's about the form also. The last DV form I saw clearly stated -- so now I am going to read verbatim: "I swear" -- quote, "I swear that the foregoing information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that making a false statement on this petition will subject me to criminal penalties."

And so I guess my question for this task force is, what exactly are those criminal penalties? How often has that happened in practice? How do we find out? You know, is that via, like, an RSA 91-A, Right to Know, or like a Part 1 Article 8 request to, like, the Judicial Branch or the Attorney General's Office or all of the various local police departments? And I would ask if this Task Force would be doing anything like that, or sort of would that burden fall on the general public to try and find that stuff out?

And again, this is because I think the gold standard to protect everybody is all about the court system getting it right in each of these cases so that the citizens of New Hampshire can get the protection from harassment, and often, protection from much, much worse that they deserve.



And I'd like to especially thank Justice Marconi for pointing out you're hearing from all perspectives.

And I thank you for your time. And if there are questions, I can take them. Other than that, I'm done. Thank you very much.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you for a well-prepared statement.

MR. ALBRECHT: Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Erica Austin.

MS. AUSTIN: Good afternoon, Justice Marconi and honorable members of this domestic violence task force. My name is Erica Austin, and I'm here today as a domestic violence survivor, as a mother of a child survivor of violence, and as an advocate for victims and survivors in New Hampshire.

My experience with the court -- state court system profoundly impacted not only my life but the life of my oldest child. And I appreciate willingness to listen to my experience. You all have the power to bring transparency and accountability to the system for victims of domestic violence, and I'm so grateful for your time.

Like many other victims of -- of domestic abuse who are acting as a protective parent, my experience with the New Hampshire judicial system left me and my child unprotected and with a feeling of perpetual hopelessness. My child is still

not allowed to have a voice, so today, I speak for the both of us.

To give a brief history, I was young and naïve and unknowingly became involved with a dangerous person. He suffers from severe mental health issues and had a lengthy criminal history in both Massachusetts and New Hampshire. In fact, he is a lifetime registered sexual offender. I did not have access to this information when I was dating him and became pregnant with our child.

Being a young, single mother, forced to grow up very quickly, I was and am very fortunate to have the unwavering support of my family. My child custody case quickly became what the legal professionals call highly contentious when I learned that my child was being abused during their time with my ex.

Like many parents in my shoes, I was forced to be a strong, protective advocate for my child, including inside the courtroom. Although our laws state the best interest of the child should be central into a parenting case, the judge in my case was far more interested in protecting the rights of the child's father and admonishing me for reporting child abuse.

The fact is that horrible acts of child abuse were occurring. The ongoing abuse was evaluated and documented by numerous medical professionals, and physical evidence was found. Despite credible physical evidence of abuse and direct

disclosures from my child, the judge ignored the recommendations of the guardian ad litem and every other professional and ultimately ordered that our child would have unsupervised visitation with their father.

My job as a parent was to fight for my child's legal rights to safety, and that's exactly what I did. This legal undertaking was not inexpensive, financially or emotionally.

And it became clear that the judge was furious that I would not stop advocating for the court to protect our child.

I was penalized by this judge for reporting the horrific acts of abuse against my child, but I did not give up. I brought my concerns to the legislature and helped pass the provision in RSA 461-A that provides safeguards for protective parents who act in good faith to report abuse. During that process, I met many other protective parents who experienced similar retaliation by judges for bringing forward good-faith allegations of serious abuse which were also corroborated by medical experts, DCYF, GALs, and forensic interviewers.

As you can imagine, this judge became even more angry when he learned of my advocacy efforts outside of the courtroom, including a report to the Judicial Conduct Committee. My experience with this New Hampshire judge and the individuals he manipulated and threatened within the system for his own benefit has profoundly traumatized me and

forever changed how I view the world.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Take your time.

MS. AUSTIN: He stripped me of the ability to protect my child and left me with a near-constant fear that I won't be able to protect my child. I do not feel safe in this state anymore. He left me believing that my voice doesn't matter and that it will never be heard.

And the pain of watching what's happening to my child and seeing firsthand the injuries he returned home with will forever be burned in my head. My fear of not being able to protect him from a convicted sexual predator was so severe that I could only lean on the support of my family, attorneys, and friends that were my constants, and I am forever grateful to them.

As I stand here today, my fear of the power of that one judge is just as strong as it was back then, and part of me is afraid he will hear me speak and cause further damage.

No one should have to live this way. The trauma this judge caused to my son and myself will (indiscernible).

Even after my case ended, my family and I continued to receive calls from individuals in New Hampshire who struggled with cases similar to mine. I remained in contact with the various domestic violence organizations, and attorneys would hear stories, the same story repeatedly.

Almost four years ago, I decided I could no longer be silent

about what was happening, and I needed to put context to what happened in my case.

Currently, I use my experience to partner with crisis centers in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. I work with (audio interference) to support women in gaining strength and rebuilding their lives through a trauma-informed fitness model.

I've learned that, through my work, my case is not at all unique. I am passion -- I am a passionate advocate, and I do my very best to work with domestic violence survivors interested in learning skills that help give them a fighting chance, even when the system is revictimizing them and their children, because to be clear, the horrific event that brought us all here today, where a woman was nearly killed, is not an isolated case.

The only difference is that what happened most recently is very public. It couldn't be swept under the rug or hidden in darkness, where domestic violence so often fuels. It shined a spotlight on a broken judicial system, but it is neither isolated nor surprising to me that the failure of our state court system caused this.

People who hear from victims and work in the system need to know that these are not extreme cases. There are judges sitting in the Circuit Court who simply don't want to preside over domestic violence and highly contentious



parenting cases and who have a blatant bias against victims of abuse. Further, there is, currently, no real system in place to hold them accountable.

Although I have experienced the horrific failures of this system, I stand here today because I have faith in all of you. I have seen change happen in the world and in people, and I believe in hope. My ask today is that you recommend ways to provide real oversight and measures of accountability for judges who make decisions that impact the safety of our most vulnerable citizens and their children.

That is the most important thing you can do, recommend a transparent process for accountability, evaluation, training, and oversight by a group of experts in the field of domestic violence. Data must be collected on how judges are ruling in domestic violence cases and should be accessible to the public. I should be able to see how many times Judge Hall is denying protective orders versus her peers who sit in other courts.

There are few jobs in this country where you are appointed to a lifelong position with enormous power over the direct safety of others, literally, life-or-death decisions. The State of New Hampshire and the judiciary have an obligation to ensure these enormously powerful positions are not abused and that there is oversight and accountability to those who are fortunate enough to be appointed.



The expertise is sitting right here before me, and I hope that the Judicial Branch doesn't create a report that sits on a shelf, gathering dust. Rather, I hope that all of you will be valued as an ongoing resource to the courts, who desperately need your professional expertise. Thank you. Can I leave my testimony here?

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Vivian Girard.

MS. GIRARD: Thank you, Your Honor and members of the committee. I first just want to say, with all this stuff, I just feel like I have to say I -- I -- I feel like I'm living the Chewbacca defense here. You got that one, didn't you?

I'm sorry, but I've actually had to speak quite a bit before the court study this week at the House of Representatives, as well as harassment for the court study and through the Senate level for the -- for the Senate committee.

Just to give you guys a little understanding of who I am -- and as you know, I've been before this -- in this room before you before, so this kind of brings back a little PTSD for me. So first of all, I just want to let you know that I am a business owner. I'm a good mother of two girls. I've been in the court system for seven years, so my girls are now 13 and 15. My 15-year-old had a disability. I also cared for both my parents, and now I'm just caring for my mother. She is elderly with -- she's on oxygen, has a walker, and I -- you

probably remember back then as well.

Back in 2 -- August 2015, I found out that my ex was cheating after me -- cheating with -- with me, after 19 years of marriage. At the time, my ex had called in a false police report after I found him cheating. The police came, took my guns from my home. They also checked my car that day, after I had 30 guns pointed at my head.

They (audio interference) my children out of the back of my car. Again, my daughter had a disability, and she was probably about eight years old at the time. There was no guns, no alcohol, no drugs were found in the car, on me, or anything else. I was actually brought to Lowell General Hospital, where I had to get a blood test. I had to be checked for suicidal. I had to be checked for all kinds of things that were just a complete false report.

DCI -- DCYF was told that Mother was arrested, but there was no arrest found. They told -- they were told that I was manic, with borderline or narcissistic personality disorder, which I was never diagnosed for anything; also a false police report.

My divorce, at that point, caused my eight-year-old child, at the time, to be put in a mental institution for a week, because at the time, I had a court marital restraining order against my ex from harassment, based on the RSA 644.

There were threats. There was unauthorized entry into the

family home, based on the RSA 635.

At the time, this was in December of 2015. My court records contained over 400 dockets. And when courts get too many deviations from the judge, this is what happens. This is all the mistakes that were put on my case that I actually went to court on in August of this year, just to fix my court orders. And still, I don't have a valid court order. This is my DCYF file.

Again, I'm a business owner. I'm a good mother. My court dockets contain over 400 dockets. I've been to this Supreme Court four times on appeal, based on child support.

Again, been in the system for seven years. I have 22 court hearings. I had three bad judges, which I'm sure you know.

So the system allowed so many frivolous motions in my case, even going back to funerals, remote learning, medical bills, child support, and so much more. So the law should be limited, also, on the harassment part that would stop the scheduling of frivolous court motions. And in my case, there should be high-conflict judges or family case coordinators or something just to keep us out of court. And I'm going to let you know why I'm going into all this at the end.

Unfortunately, the family court ordered so many of the foundation issues on my case -- they ignored them to the point that I had to come to the Supreme Court four times. It became a huge financial hardship on me, which rippled down to

my children. If it's supposed to be all about the children, it's not. So based on the lack of child support in my case, as well as medical support and so on, I actually could not get that support from my ex. So I was forced to be on medical through the State of New Hampshire.

This is detriment to families by extending these litigations and frivolous pleadings to the detriment of financial resources. Absolutely, this affected my relationship with my children because I could not do the same as what my ex did. This led to huge financial impact to my family.

So I am concerned that the rights were violated in my case, not only with the false DCYF investigations, the -the false harassments that were put on me because I got a
marital restraining order after what was seen by the judge, at
the time, of what he was doing, videotaping me, recording me,
breaking into the -- the family home. Because I had that
marital restraining order at the time of my divorce, I was not
able to keep my restraining order on him.

This caused seven years of harassment, legal harassment within the court system. And somebody should be held accountable. This jeopardized my safety because at the time, they put a false domestic violence on me, being a good mother, because he called in a fake police report. And by calling in this fake police report, which I have it here and

I'd like to submit it at some point to you people, as well as some of the other evidence that I show in here that they released me from the hospital, saying, you two need marital counseling. I said, no, I need a divorce.

So the incident -- just to kind of give you a quick heads-up here, the incident was on 8/21 of '15. The police report was 8/25 of '15. There was an ex parte done on 11/10 of '15 to take my guns away from me because I was in -- my kids were in imminent danger to me. I lost my kids for a short amount of time, until DCYF agreed that I was a fit mother. Again, another thing that I did not have to go through; another thing my kids did not have to be traumatized with. But they returned my firearms on 8/11 of 2016.

Just to recap that, it took three months from the time this false police report went through for them to take my firearms. I had some guy harassing me day and night, just constant harassment in my family home, with my children, with my elderly parents. Took three months to take my firearms away. After that, it took me 10 months to return my firearms. That is not a normal DV. I've never had anything on my record, never had an arrest, never went to court for it. But I had to go to court for the return of my firearm.

All I can say to you guys today is the emotional trauma that it caused not only me, my children, my elderly parents, the PTSD of waking up in the middle of the night,



terrified for every noise, and I had no way to protect myself or my family. And just like being in this room today, it -- I -- I came in here, and I -- my heart just started racing because this is where I had a lot of bad memories.

This behavior just has to stop. The impact on the kids is huge. The impact on me was huge. I have friends here today: Dana, Dave, Angela (phonetic). Thank you for your support. The -- when my sister-in-law died a couple weeks ago, Dana wanted to come to my sister-in-law's funeral. He could not because of a false DV on him. And let me just give you an idea of why that is. His church --

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: (Audio interference) course (indiscernible) --

MS. GIRARD: Yeah, that's okay.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: -- into the --

MS. GIRARD: I'm done.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: -- topic here. All right.

MS. GIRARD: And -- and the topic is his church was right next door to the funeral home. False DV, through church, funeral home next door, he couldn't go because it was next door.

I met a lot of good people because of this, so I -I have to say this did bring one good thing to light here.
But families should not go through this. Being delimited on what you can do, the fact that I lost my -- my safety and my

security and my freedom, my Second Amendment rights, RSA 633, was taken away from me. My protection for my family was taken away from me in my most -- my -- my most precious time, when I needed it, when I -- when I was being harassed, when I was concerned about my safety. I had no way to protect myself or my kids because of a false DV on me. And I have no grounds for it. So I just would like it to stop.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you.

MS. GIRARD: Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Dave Smith.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Your Honors, members of the staff. I don't public speak, so please try to enjoy me as much as everyone else does.

I came to this from a slightly different angle as well. I echo the sentiments of Mr. Albrecht. I consider myself an innocent respondent of 173. I owned a home, a small home-based business, a word-of-mouth contracting business at the time. And once the idea had circled around town that I beat my wife, which I was never even accused of, my business fell apart like wildfire.

For some reason, I wasn't allowed my work property, as required by law. And upon demanding -- me demanding to Marital Master DalPra to give me my work property back, he said he gave me everything I need. And it then took me another two years to get my stuff back, working through my --

with my father-in-law, despite, by the time I had got it, I was already awarded it after the divorce was over. So it's completely unnecessary.

In my case, I was having a consensual relationship with someone else, and then I found myself served with a DV in which I was found to have sat on my wife eight months earlier.

I was given no opportunity to -- to deny this, present any evidence, present any testimony or police reports or anything.

After the hearing, was awarded a unique 90-day DV from Julie Introcaso, which allowed me to go to the house every day, do child exchanges at the house. And of course, they had no good reason to appeal because the alternative would have been the statutory year.

So went straight to the police department after my hearing to report this fraud against me, as I saw it. And I recall a detective stating that the extreme low standard of 173 and the fact everything is domestic violence is why I was there. Well, I'm here to mount an opposition to this madness.

Any story of good and evil can easily be manipulated when only one side is telling their predetermined narrative.

Based on lack of standards that the DV has to do with assumptions and harmful dissemination of false information and the court's flagrant disinterest in the other side of the story, it caused me a lot of harm.

173 is an amazing mechanism for building precedent



or shutting down Constitutional rights and civil liberties in the name of security. I hear a lot of discussion about victims of abuse and their abusers. And that's real. I get that. But I don't hear much about the rights of the accused or innocent respondents, or even -- especially if the respondent did nothing whatsoever.

You can't just create a minority group of people and then treat them differently. 173-B operates under a real due process defect. 173 is structured to push stress -- stressed and scorned alleged victims into bad or even illegal behaviors for the exchange of a little control in their life and an easy reward at taxpayer expense, not to mention the expenses to the parties and the children.

I felt completely overwhelmed by an unstoppable wave of what I see as lawlessness under the illusion of law with a branch of government. How 173 can be used as a card to gain the upper hand in divorce, eliminate the presumption of equitable division of property, and a way to slander and libel someone, I just can't figure out.

Our judicial system was set up to protect the rights of all. But in the cases of 173, it's instead used to overrun some of us. It allows enablers and glorifiers the ability to break stuff, annoy people, and generally harm the otherwise good relations that must exist between the parties in all but the most extreme cases.



46
This scheme currently requires that the innocent
shall suffer along with the guilty. If you look at the
criteria for abuse, the extreme imbalance of power, creating
fear, controlling everything, controlling, managing all the
money, interference of freedom, legal harassment, placing
people in fear of their safety, and otherwise limiting
someone's pursuit of happiness, then in my case, the absolute
grand champion of abuse is the State of New Hampshire using
173 on me. That's stunning.
If a it seems to me if a junior high class were
asked to write a law without using civil rights, they might
come up with something like this.
I'd be happy to answer any questions or discuss this
further with the committee.
JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: You don't do so badly for not having public speaking training.

MR. SMITH: I appreciate it. I appreciate that. Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Ashley Stowers.

MS. STOWERS: Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to just speak today. I'll apologize in advance. I mostly have bullet-pointed statements because this is something that, for me, passion is going to invoke a little

bit more empathy here. And I can tell you that reading the list of points that were meant to be discussed today, my initial reaction to everything on the list was I have something to say about that.

I am here today because I am a domestic violence survivor. And unfortunately, my experiences with the court have been negative, to say the least. When I was 17, I was groomed by a predator 10 years my age, and I found myself in an abusive situation.

When I was 18 years old, I found out that I was pregnant. And I -- I very quickly realized that any thought that I may have had that something would change, at that point, was fruitless.

When I was finally able to get free, I did have to file for a restraining order, which was granted.

Unfortunately, to my abuser, it was a piece of paper, and it was an inconvenience for him to achieve his goal of owning me in every sense of the word. He broke into my house and kidnapped me at gunpoint when I was almost eight months pregnant. He put me in the back of my vehicle, tied up like an animal, and he drove around with me for almost five hours, looking for a spot to kill me and dispose of my body.

He was charged with six Class A felonies. He was given a plea deal for 13 years. And the conditions of his sentencing mandated that he not have any contact with me, my



immediate family, or anyone living in my household for a very long time. And additionally, I still had my domestic violence protective order that was granted to me at the time he violated it, which, for him, was a felony charge, as he had done so previously.

My daughter, who will be 10 years old this year, has never, ever known anything about this situation. His name was never put on her birth certificate. I asked for nothing except safety. In August of 2014, he filed a parenting petition. And for those of you who are not familiar with the aspect of receiving one of those, it was jarring in the situation, to say the least, but on top of that, it's incredibly invasive.

He requested mediation. He requested to sit in a room with me and asked for access to my child. As the conditions of his sentencing stated, he was not to have any contact with me. And I spoke to the court. I spoke with the county attorney who I had dealt with. And they agreed that that was a violation of his sentencing. And a judge agreed as well and suspended -- took some of his suspended time, gave him an additional two to four years, as there was a lot of suspended time.

His case was brought before the Supreme Court, and that decision was reversed. And while $I \ -- \ I$ understand the perspective that would have led to that decision, what



astounded me was the fact that I felt there's -- there's no way all of the information could have been available and led to the same conclusion.

When I received that paperwork from the court, I was not given an option to refuse. There was no opportunity for me to say, mediation is beyond inappropriate, and this is why. And he was not forthcoming, on the paperwork, about the true condition of his sentences.

I was told if I didn't go to court, a warrant would be issued for my arrest. And when I spoke to the court officials and I explained my situation and I said, please, this -- this is incredibly inappropriate; this doesn't apply here, they told me I had no opportunity to do anything about it, unless I chose to file a termination of parental rights, which I was financially responsible for, and I would have been financially responsible for mediation.

I had to fight every step of the way to stop a guardian ad litem from coming into my home and speaking to my daughter, who knows nothing about who this person is, and the entire time, the helplessness that I felt at feeling why do I have to explain why my child needs to be safe? Her best interests should come first. There was nothing that I could do. And had I not had the support of my family, there is absolutely no way I would have been able to afford to do something like that.

To say that it traumatized me further doesn't begin to cover it. But the protection that I'm supposed to be have to be safe, that my child is supposed to have to be safe, that was the one thing that they could give me when they sentenced him. And then it was gone.

That has weighed on my mind since 2016, when that decision was delivered by this court. And I was contacted by the victim advocate I had initially dealt with, who went out of her way to do it because she said, you won't have an opportunity to speak. There isn't anything you can do. There isn't anything you can say. But she wanted me to know.

And to think that for somebody who's -- who's been through the things that I have, and for my daughter, who I have fought tirelessly to make sure she never has to see that, to know that for somebody who's been in my shoes, they were told, he has a Constitutional right to request to know your tax information, how much money you spend on utilities; for the next step in the process, to ask me where I work, where my daughter's pediatrician's office is, who she goes to day care with, what my mental health history looks like, and that he has access to all of that information, and I can't do anything about it unless I can afford to hire an attorney to fight it in court. It broke me for a long time.

In 2019, I hit the five-year mark for the renewal portion of my restraining order, which I continued to renew,



despite the protective orders from the court, because after that decision, I knew I don't have that to rely on. My restraining order was finalized at the end of May. And in 2019, the date that it fell on happened to be Memorial Day weekend.

I went the following business day, and I was told that because I was technically two days too late, according to the date, they couldn't help me. I've read those orders back to front, multiple times. And there's nothing in it that states, we'll allow you to come in early. I always came on the day, and I was standing right outside the court because there isn't anything more important than my safety or my child's. There's nothing. It wasn't arbitrary on my part. It wasn't punitive. It was necessary.

And I did appeal to a judge that same day. And I sat, and I waited. And they said, if you want to do anything about it, you have to file a new one. You'll have to come back to court. You'll have to sit in a room with him. You'll have to see him. You'll have to go through the process all over again. And since he's incarcerated, I don't know that there's anything that you can do; it's really not that important right now, just like the parenting case I was told the paperwork isn't written for situations like yours. There just — there just isn't an option for you because we don't really deal with it all that often, so I was told to deal with

1 it.

And that's unacceptable. The law is meant to protect me, not him. It's meant to protect my child. He made his bed. And I'm only here because I fought to live, not because he changed his mind. My daughter is a happy, healthy, amazing child, who has never had to experience even a -- a second of a life like that.

To know that unless anything changes, to give people more opportunities to get help, to have access to help, to have cases be looked at on an individual basis, instead of being told, just don't see cases like this very often. The very first letter in the packet of a parenting petition says, I am writing to you as parents, not as parties in a court case.

And that monster is not a parent, and he's certainly not a parent to my daughter. But to be treated as if we're just divorced people that can't get along and that the paperwork reflects that because it doesn't matter; it's not that big of a deal; it doesn't come up very often, so we don't need to change it. You need to accept less, accept less protection, accept less safety. That's what we can give you.

To know that I go to file my restraining orders, I go to get them renewed, I take it seriously because I need it, and sorry, we can't help you; you'll have to go through all of that very traumatizing process again, and we may not help you

this time because he's incarcerated, so what does it matter?
That's unacceptable. There's nothing on that paperwork that
says, we will accept 30 days beforehand paperwork for an
extension. There's nothing, and there's no excuse why that
can't be there. There's plenty of other unnecessary verbiage
in some of those forms, and I'm sure you know that.

There's nothing for me, the onus always on a survivor to do anything to help themselves. And not everybody can afford to do that, both financially and mentally.

And I -- I -- I implore you to consider some of these things -- I could stand here all day, but I won't -- because I can't allow my daughter to grow up in that kind of world and know that I -- I didn't do anything to make it so, God forbid, that happens to her or somebody else's daughter or sister or mother or wife, that they'll go through exactly what I did, because I can't tell you the number of times I didn't want to get out of bed and do it again.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you.

MS. STOWERS: Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you for sharing. And should anything else come to mind, feel free to submit written comments in addition. Thank you.

MS. STOWERS: Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Gary Apfel.

MR. APFEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. And good



afternoon, everyone else on the committee. Thank you for allowing me and other members of the public to address you this afternoon.

I currently practice law in Lebanon, New Hampshire.

I began my legal career in 1988 as a law clerk for a federal magistrate judge in the District of Connecticut. For 14 years after that, I worked as a public defender, about 10 years of trial work and 4 years of appellate work. And since 2003, I've been in private practice, where my work consists of representing criminal defendants, representing victims of crime, representing individuals in domestic violence petitions and stalking petitions. I also have somewhat more limited experience but experience in abuse and neglect cases and some divorce work.

My point of telling you that is that yesterday's victims are oftentimes today's defendants. And today's defendants are oftentimes tomorrow's victims. And I -- I think Attorney Hornick, who has served as a public defender and as a county attorney, knows exactly what I'm talking about. And if there are other members of the commission who may or may not be here today but who have done the sort of work that we do, we know that that happens.

And my point of telling you that is that there are instances -- and I think you've heard about some of them today -- where there are some people who do really bad things,

and there are some people who have had really bad things done to them. And I've represented people in both those categories. But by and large, most of the people that we're dealing with from day to day are people who have complex situations. They do good things and bad things, and they're struggling as people, as many of us do, just to be alive and be a person.

And when we run the risk of stereotyping them, in one way or another, as being all good or all bad, bad things happen. So I come to you here this afternoon. My primary thing for you -- there is another issue I'd also like to address, but it's the importance for even-handed justice.

I need not remind you that this is a Judicial Branch task force. It's not an attorney general or Executive Branch task force, and it's not in a Legislative Branch task force.

It's imperative that Judicial Branch remain fair and even-handed. And I know, Justice Hantz Marconi, that you have set that tone as the theme of what should happen.

Policy making, as well as individual cases, need to be fair and even-handed. And there must be an appearance as well as actual administration of justice that is fair and even-handed. The consequences of failing to do so are enormous. They concern Constitutional denial of due process if we're not fair and even-handed. There's a concern about dissatisfaction of individual litigants, which I think that

you've certainly heard something about this afternoon. And more importantly, or perhaps most importantly, we run the risk of distrust of the public at large.

The stakes for plaintiffs can be quite significant. They are people who need, oftentimes, physical separation from potentially dangerous partner. And there's the issue of psychological security. The stakes for defendants are also really high, and they include the right to parent one's children, the right to live in one's home, to maintain stable housing, the right to maintain one's employment and earn an income, and the right to associate with others within the community of whom both plaintiffs and defendants in these cases are members, relatives and friends.

I also need not tell you that the impacts are immediate when one ends up in court involved in a domestic violence petition or stalking petition, because issues are -- are often decided on an ex parte basis, initially, and the orders are immediate. So I say again that any recommendations from this task force must also be even-handed, and they must comply with an even-handed and fair treatment standard.

I am concerned several proposals from the task force members to date fail to meet this standard. It is not okay, as Judge Yazinski suggested, that judges should be able to guide plaintiffs via questioning to develop facts sufficient to have a sufficient temporary or final order.



I'm not aware of any judge who aids defendants in developing exculpatory evidence, either by questioning defendants or by cross-examining plaintiffs in court. And I -- I would support what has been suggested by some task force members. It has been suggested here as well, which is also practiced, by the way, in the State of Vermont, because I live in a border community, that the (audio interference) has developed check-off-the-box forms, which are supported by additional narrative evidence. And that's a really good idea.

And what that does is -- I mean, I also should tell you I practice in front of Judge Yazinski on a regular basis. He's one of the best judges in the Circuit Court bench, and he wants to do the right thing. I'm sorry I'm not here to engage in discussion with him about it personally this afternoon. So like, I think, all of you, he's trying to make sure the right thing is done and make sure the people who are in need of services aren't deprived them.

But I would challenge him, and I would challenge

Judge Carbon, if you were handling one of these cases, and/or

anyone else to walk down the streets of -- of -- of Claremont

or Plymouth and say to someone, listen, I want to know if you

were a litigant -- litigant in a case, and someone on the

other side, I helped that person prepare the complaint against

you on a ex parte basis and asked them questions about that,

and then I'm going to decide your case; is that okay by you?

And there's no member of the public would say that's all right, not one.

It is not okay, as it was suggested by Attorney
Krueger, to hide from defendants domestic violence petitions
that have been denied because they weren't adequate, or at
least that's how I understood what she was saying when she
spoke at the January 11th meeting. Maybe I misunderstand
that, and if so, I apologize. But we can't have documents
hide -- hidden from one side so only the other side is aware.
It's not a fair and just way to run a system, and it creates a
perception that what we're doing is -- is not even-handed.

It's not okay for the Judicial Branch to facilitate access to counsel for plaintiffs without also doing the same thing for defendants, as is, I understand, the task force proposal.

I've been a member of the Bar Association (audio interference) Services Committee -- well, it's changed names now, and -- and function has been reduced, but since 1990.

And we struggled for years with the -- with the issues about providing adequate legal services for the vast number of people who can't afford lawyers. It's a huge issue. It's one we struggle with all the time, and it's one that we're constantly having conversations about how (audio interference) lawyers to help; how do we simplify forms; how do we make the system more friendly, what's inherently unfriendly for pro se

litigants.

And we're not prepared as a society, and certainly, the State of New Hampshire and our legislature is not prepared to say that we're going to have a legal aid system that provides whatever legal services for whatever sorts of civil cases when people can't afford them. Perhaps we should, and I think there are pros and cons for that. But that's certainly not going to come out of this task force or this next legislative session because it requires an entirely different way about thinking about how we, as a society, operate.

And short of that, if we're talking about developing a system -- and it -- trust me that not only judges but those of us who represent individuals, whether they are victims or whether they are defendants, when there's not a lawyer on the other side, it makes the work for all of us much harder. And oftentimes, it does make the results less fair.

I also see a lot of cases where due to the goodness of -- of many lawyers who are willing to offer voluntary services to alleged victims of domestic violence, that they appear without charge. The Bar Association has a program for that, and the DOVE program. We have no program like that for defendants. And if they're not charged criminally -- and that's a separate forum, separate cases, and not something that's immediately in front of the task force right now -- they oftentimes end up in court unrepresented.

And they're oftentimes subjected, if they don't want to lose their children, if they want to have a place to live, that they need to testify. And there's been discussion in task force about defense lawyers asking questions of -- of plaintiffs without representation. It works the other way around as well.

And again, the point I stress to you, that as a Judicial Branch task force, it's important for you to seek systems and resolutions and make recommendations to court and whatever recommendations made to the legislature that help all of these people in need.

Alan Cronheim talked to you, earlier on today, about how, oftentimes, parties, in fact, reach negotiated resolutions in these cases, sometimes with findings of domestic violence, sometimes with continuations of temporary orders.

What I also want to tell you, as someone who's working in the trenches, is that there are absolutely cases where people will never have contact with each other again and should not. And I think you heard testimony about that just before I spoke -- I got up to speak this afternoon. And there are some other mechanisms that, also, we have for dealing with that, not only equity petitions in the Superior Court, but if -- in a situation I just heard, it's not clear to me why someone didn't advise that poor person why she shouldn't have

sought a termination of parental rights for the other individual.

But most of the cases -- and I think it's what we need to be concerned with, about the ones we're dealing with from day to day -- are people who are going to -- whether they like it or not, are going to continue to have a relationship with each other for a really long time to come.

And a lot of times, a six-month or a year coolingoff period does that for them. And they have some mechanisms
through the family court that allows things to work, people to
counsel, people to communicate with each other on a limited
basis. And I find, representing both sides, that more often
than not, they want to do something about that because their
children are demanding it and because they feel that their
children need that. It also depends, of course, how old the
children are.

But if we treat everything as it's all good or all bad, and we don't have mechanisms to deal with it in a even-handed way, we don't serve those people who need our help as the professionals, whether we're lawyers, we're judges, we're victims, we -- advocates, we're psychologists, whatever we're doing. We're letting those people down. And the bigger issue that we need to look at is how do we provide other services so it's not either just -- it's abuse, no contact, or it's not abuse, and go about your way.

And we are letting people down in that way as well. I know that Dr. Hampton has talked about some of the -- the scientific studies dealing with some issues, but with respect to domestic violence, I would submit to you there's a lot of other work going on as well, including about issues about how to ultimately make families stronger.

The third issue I'd like to address is that of -composes with respect to the expanded definition of abuse.

The current definition effectively requires two things.

First, there must be an enumerated criminal act. And by the way, I think the suggestion about saying which criminal act or acts that are alleged is actually a really good idea on a check-off-the-box form. It makes it clear for everyone about what's going on.

Second element required by RSA 173-B is that there be a credible, present threat of danger. There have been various proposals to eliminate one or both of these criteria, and they are problematic, both conceptually and as a practical matter, for judges and for litigants.

For example, I know there has been discussion from the task force with respect to the issue of financial abuse.

And I say to you, how do we define that? When is it okay for one partner to decline to spend money that she or he earned on something that the other party wants? How about a family member or one's sibling or one's child or, in a domestic

violence statute, we also allow petitions for roommates. Are we going to talk about financial abuse in that context, and what does that mean?

Question arises, is there any right to set limits in a financial relationship between individuals, and when does it cross over the line? If so, how will a statute give adequate notice to individuals what is and isn't permitted? And are courts prepared to take evidence regarding what, in that context, might be years of purely economic data, when that oftentimes, in divorce cases, which, increasingly, I try to avoid taking as part of my practice, are multi-day proceedings that often require resolving of these types of issues?

I submit to you that we now have a clear statute.

And I'm not denying that one can use one's economic situation as a power mechanism against another person in ways that are inappropriate. What I am saying to you is -- is that that is a very difficult thing to define in a way that we can have a workable court system.

The issue is even more so with respect to emotional abuse. How do we define that? Is being mean to someone adequate grounds to lose one's home and one's kids? And how mean can you be without being too mean? That's a -- that's, again, a very, very difficult thing to -- to try and figure out.

And to the extent that you're going to be making



recommendations to the legislature about potential modifications in our statute, I urge you to think about where that's going to lead us. It's just going to make -- and these cases are oftentimes, especially if there are not lawyers involved, cases that are decided in half an hour. And that's with testimony from both sides, because that's all AOC will say is allotted for these cases by weighted caseloads. And that -- and -- and getting into those sorts of things in these contexts, it's very difficult.

The ultimate test, I submit to you, with respect to domestic violence and stalking statutes, is that they should be remedial in nature. And I apologize for (audio interference) off from another jurisdiction, not specific cases, but there's a lot of Vermont law on that. I just happen to know that because I often practice there. I'm not sure how much we discuss that in our New Hampshire case law, and I did not research that issue before coming in front of you this afternoon. But I am fairly certain that's the notion (audio interference) statute as well, or statutes, I should say, which is to prevent harm from happening.

And it's one of the reasons why we have relaxed the rules of evidence. It's one of the reasons we have relaxed the burdens of proof and that we've made other accommodations. What that means is the statutes are meant to prevent a credible danger of real and immediate, imminent harm. When

that is not of concern, there are other adequate forums available when there is no imminent danger.

There are divorce lawyers. And I think Judge
Yazinski talked about that. There are parenting plans. For
household members, there are also civil suits, including
intentional infliction of emotional distress. And we've
talked some also, again, this afternoon about termination of
parental rights.

So I -- I would sum up by saying that I urge you, as I think it's your goal to do, to -- to think about coming up with mechanisms that improves the system, that improves it for all the litigants that are involved. And certainly, both of us who -- and I think Mr. Cronheim said this. There are few of us who are in private practice who aren't representing people on both sides, because we're running business, and we take money where it comes from.

So we're -- we're aware that these sorts of things are going on, and it's important to us because we know that one day it's one side, and one day it's the other. And as I indicated, you know, people who, as children, are emotionally abused or physically abused or sexually abused, they often end up in trouble as defendants in the system. And it's oftentimes -- I mean, it really is true. I represent both, first once as a victim, then as a defendant, and then a victim again.

And I urge you to think of these as all people who need help and support, even though that sometimes means, you know, providing restrictions, separating people, and other sorts of things like that. And thank you for letting me address you this afternoon.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you.

Good?

Christine Monigle. Did I get that right?

MS. MONIGLE: Yes. All members of the New Hampshire DV Task Force, Counselor, Chief, Doctors, and ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today.

I have two boys. I've been separated and then divorced from their father since they were one and a half and two and a half years old. We had lived with their father in a foreign country until the time of our separation, when I moved back to my home in Boston.

We separated soon after our older son had been hospitalized for a week during his second birthday, due to trauma and anxiety. Boston Children's Hospital, where we were sent from our country of residence, recommended that Child Protective Services be activated back in the country we lived in. Soon after, I filed for divorce in Massachusetts for cruelty and abuse and was awarded sole legal and physical custody of both boys by Suffolk County Family Court in Boston,

Massachusetts.

In 2016, I moved to the State of New Hampshire with my two sons, who were five and six years old at the time. A year later, I filed my Massachusetts order in New Hampshire Family Court and had their father served in his country, as he's not an American citizen or a resident.

Both biolog -- both boys -- I'm sorry. Boys' biological father can travel to the United States on a B-1/B-2 visa by U.S. Immigration. The January -- in January 2018, when my request to move the Massachusetts court order to New Hampshire was being heard, unbeknownst to me, upon arrival to the New Hampshire court, their father also appeared for the first time in a U.S. court.

Over the past six years, he had not only not been in contact with the boys but only saw them six times, disappearing for months and even years at a time. My cell phone, email, and counsel were the same as they had always been since the time of our separation. Nonetheless, I agreed to mediate and would agree for him to see the children if he agreed to work with their -- their therapist and the IEP team at school to reunify with them.

After his first meeting with the children's local therapist, he -- she called DCYF and the children's school. I filed an emergency ex parte, requesting the order to stop contact immediately. A guardian ad litem was then ordered by

the New Hampshire court. This guardian ad litem provided hospital reports from Boston Children's Hospital, their school, and IEP records from a number 1 school district in New Hampshire, psychiatric notes from the largest and most respected hospital in New Hampshire, and phone contact with the children's local therapist.

She also initiated a supervised visit with herself and the children's father. She pushed through with the visit, despite the fact that the school had emailed and called her to report that the older child, the same child that had been hospitalized, had run away from school and couldn't be found for over an hour.

Nonetheless, the GAL reported that the visit went fine, such that the court then ordered the parents attend coparenting therapy, that Father spend two three-day weekends with the children, once in February and again in April of 2019.

At the February visit, I had to force my children to see their father to comply with the court order. But they refused to stay overnight with him. I brought them back and forth to his hotel for three days, staying with them, at his request, to make it easier for them.

Between February and April, we had Zoom coparenting therapy, up until the boys' father receive -- refused to participate. The therapist wrote a letter to our counselor



and counselors and the GAL that I had attended every meeting but that the father was passive-aggressive, uncooperative, and not showing up to the scheduled meetings, and therefore, was discontinuing coparenting therapy.

When their father returned in April, I again delivered my children to his hotel, where he berated me in front of the children regarding the coparenting therapy later -- letter. Then he forced the children to stay with him overnight, did not allow them to call me, did not provide the older children his medicate -- the older child his medication or CPAP machine, as prescribed by the children's doctor, all in contempt of the order.

I reported this to the GAL, counselors, and children's therapist. But again, the GAL stated to the court that reunification was complete and recommended to the court that the children be allowed to leave the United States with their father for a one-week visit to his home and visit his family, despite the fact that the children had never been away from their mother that long.

In August of 2019, at Boston Logan Airport, I handed my children's passports over to my abuser and watched my children walk away, not knowing if I would ever see them again. But I was told if I did not do so, I could risk being incarcerated.

They did return, and my older son was traumatized.



I took videos, showing the GAL and the court regression, dissociation, meltdowns, and full shutdowns. Despite discussions with local therapists, hospital psychiatric notes, DCYF reports, IEP school reports and behavioral charts, and coparenting therapist letters, the final report that the GAL presented to the New Hampshire court stated the only credible source the GAL had spoken to about me and the children was a woman that we had not seen in seven years and lived in the father's country.

This was the only credible source the GAL claimed, which she had no professional license, no certifications, and no experience with child trauma. The woman was, in fact, a friend from church.

The report went on to say that credible source did admit that there was yelling, hitting in our home.

Nonetheless, the GAL wrote that I, the mother, was well educated; I had access to money and travel. Therefore, she did not believe that I or the children had been abused while living with the father in a foreign country.

In 2019, I was kept on the stand for one and a half days by opposing counsel, going page by page through my older son's hospital reports. I was berated and accused of Munchausen by proxy and parent alienation -- alienation. Yet I stayed calm, while every part of me was screaming in pain.

The boys' father was on the stand for about 30



minutes, maybe. And at that time, he finally admitted emailing me a sorry for my behavior and the way I treated you email. His mask then fell off, and he blew up on the stand, to the point where his lawyer had to advise him to stop talking.

After hearing all of this, you would think that I would have maintained the Suffolk County's order for me to have sole legal and physical custody. I did not. The order is joint decision-making, and I have the veto vote or final decision-making, after I have proven that I have a discussion with the boys' father.

To this day, he continues to block my ability to get the children back into therapy, as court-ordered, outside of school. And within months after the final trial, the father's counsel filed five additional contempts against me when I tried to get them back into therapy.

It's been nearly three years since that order.

Their father never followed the Massachusetts order. He has never followed the New Hampshire order. And he's still out -- in and out of the boys' lives for weeks to months on end.

At one time, he came to see them in the last two years for a four-day visit. I overlooked the court-ordered documentation he was supposed to provide me and even received an email from the -- their father's counselor, thanking me for not weaponizing the pandemic. Yet again, the boys didn't want

to spend time with their father. They came home furious and hurt due to his behavior.

The boys are now 10 and 11 years old. They have their own phone now and refuse to speak to him. They send him text messages telling him to leave them alone. So I again got involved and called him on the speakerphone to help them work it out between the boys. He proceeded to rant and rave, berate me, gaslight the children, make it all our fault. He did not send birthday gifts, Christmas presents, and has not called since.

If he's true to form, he will file against me in court again in a few months or a -- a few years for another round, and I will go bankrupt again trying to protect my children. I have been told by counsel that my children won't be heard by the court until they're 13 or 14 years old, nor will the court care about my one bad visit during the pandemic.

After the last visit and a 20-year career in academic research support, I have changed my profession. I am now a certified -- I am now certified in all 50 states as a high-conflict divorce coach. I am also a trained survivor supporter on a 24-hour crisis line. I spend most of my nights, sometimes all night, in emergency rooms, police stations, and on the phone, helping survivors.

I help them and work with their lawyers to prepare



highly triggering documentation so that it clearly shows unhealthy parenting, co -- counter-parenting, child manipulation, abuse, threatening communication. And I help survivors coparent with -- coparent and communicate with their abuser when they are ordered to do so by the courts, under a microscope, so that they don't lose access to their children to their abuser.

Please help me help them. Please train counselors and guardian ad litems and judges to acknowledge what is right in front of them. Please listen to the children and be accountable for holding abusers accountable for what they do to their spouses and their children.

Thank you so much for your time and your attention.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you.

And Betty Gay.

MS. GAY: Thank you very much. I'm not a great speaker. I'm one of those politicians who's against the rules because I'm not a good speaker and I can't remember people's names. But I appreciate all very much that y'all care deeply about this problem.

As a -- an abused mom many years ago, I was lucky and didn't have to go through family court. My ex didn't want me to mention that he had a 20,000 dollar gun collection, so we split everything else down the middle. I got the kids, and he broke their hearts because he didn't want to see them very

much. So you know, two years apart, he'd see my son two weekends for about two hours. And they'd sit there and wait for him.

So my experience is very different. You know, actually, it turned out to be a blessing that he wasn't involved. And now he's very hurt that his kids don't want to see him. So that's the reward you get, you know, when you don't want to be a parent.

I just had to send my glasses off to get them a new lens, so we're going back to my adjusted vision. I have lots of bullet points, so I'll try to stop talking in sentences and just give you a whole lot of subjects that I've become aware of from people who called me once I became a rep. And I could read messages that they would send everybody.

I answered one because when Kathy (phonetic) -
Kathy was quoted in the article, so I gave great credence

because I've known Kathy for about 22 years. So I -- I

know -- I know this person now, and that was my baptism into

how many awful things can happen to you in family court.

I don't want to paint all judges and all court officials with the same brush. However, there are so many bad apples, they need to be rooted out. And when I found that a trusted friend, who you would know if I said her name, so I'm not going to say it -- she'd kill me. When she found out about things like reunification therapy, she had never heard

of it. Everybody loved the judge that she had ever met, loved the judge who was ordering it.

And it wasn't -- so I said, can I send you testimony, written testimony, by people who had endured it? She's a really good reader, so she said, yes. And after she read the 10 pages, she sends me a text: this is really disturbing. So she has started asking judges about this particular judge.

And one of them said to her -- and of course, she's not going to tell me who he was, either. Anyway, he said, oh, that judge? If he has a choice to give custody to a mother who is a protective mother, who has always taken care of the children, and a guy who's just got out of prison after 10 years, he's going to give the kids to the guy.

Okay. That breaks my heart that people know bad things are happening, but they're not willing or there is no system for them to speak out and to hold people accountable and get them off the bench. They -- they probably are good at some other form of law, but not children and children going through ACEs.

If we don't reform family courts so that children DV victims get the best treatment, the children grow up with many ACEs, and we know, tragically, most of them have their lives really screwed up. The need for training, updated training in domestic abuse, is critical for court personnel, not just

judges; GALs, everybody who has a decision-making part.

I'm trying to quote -- I'll just have to use my own words. You're probably familiar with the attorney Barry Goldstein. He's written multiple books about domestic abuse and court. And he's pointing out, which was reinforced by the Jenesse Center in California that had a -- a seminar with mothers from all across the country, talking about losing their children to abusers. One of -- one of -- I'm losing my thought because I'm thinking of three things at once.

One of the ways to reduce domestic abuse is to make judges not make decisions and expect the police to follow them. If somebody breaks a restraining order, they're supposed to be arrested. The -- his last book was about success at greatly reducing domestic abuse, simply by enforcing the law. And the city in Massachusetts where the Adams were from, which -- Quincy. It's in the title of the book. But something as simple as just follow the law and don't slap wrists; really make it hurt when you break the law.

But we really, really need to train court personnel and judges how to recognize domestic abuse. It's not bruises anymore. The threat of bruises is what keeps most families in line. But you don't have to define exactly what financial coercion is. When you get to court, you can discuss it.

People can figure out what coercion is.

If you have a whole lot of money but -- well, when



you see -- when you go through a -- a divorce, you can see coercion. The abuser has a really good attorney, and the abused doesn't because -- usually, it's a she, 90 -- what, 97 percent. She doesn't have access to the money. So that's just one example.

Stop reunification therapy. It is a favorite created by Richard Gardner. He was also known for advocating for sex with children, that it didn't hurt them; reporting it was more damaging to them than the abuse itself. That's in writing. You do have to look for it because the people who favor reunification therapy sure don't want us to see that.

Reunification therapy is not family therapy. I am a strong supporter of family therapy that's done by a person who has training, and they get certified after they've been observed. They don't just, you know, order a (indiscernible). But you — if you're any kind of therapist or a therapist at all, you can hang out a shingle that says you're a reunification therapist, and you can be ordered.

Currently, despite what a judge said in my hearings the other day, I have 16 bills in front of the House right now, each one a separate issue to try to adjust unfair practices in family court. I'm sorry. I go off, but just so many things.

I had a judge come to speak against my bill on reunification therapy because she likes to order it. I'll --

if you are interested, I can send you the testimony from five people what it was like to go through. It looks like North Korean interrogation. It was, oh, you don't want to see your abusive parent? Well, you need to make a relationship. It doesn't matter if you were abused. You need -- it's more important to have relationship with them, so you will come to counseling, and you will speak -- sit in front of your abuser for one to two hours, maybe even up to four hours a week for months.

Often, it's the abused parent who gets to pay for this. It's, like, 150 to 300 dollars an hour. And others have said, I don't make that much money in a week. And this particular woman, who I can quote, they said to her, your parents can pay for it. That's got to be illegal. But who are you going to talk to? Who are you going to appeal to when you are told in no uncertain terms that if you don't do what you're told to do, you are going to lose your kids; their — their custody is going to be given to the abuser?

Part of my bills are to give more alternatives.

It's -- it's in these cases -- I don't mean that this happens all over the state. But it is happening. It's continuing to happen, and we've got to stop it. And it's -- it's a moneymaking -- money-making scheme. Reunification therapy, because it has no training and no certification, it has no medical code. Therefore, you can't get any insurance coverage. So

you pay out of your pocket this huge amount of money.

That's not the only kind of counseling that can be ordered. I mean, they can order, and they do -- judges do order regular kind of personal therapy from certified people. But it can be excessive. It can be going for a year and out -- or two, and outstrip what your insurance covers.

So not only are you going through the heartache of dealing with somebody who's abused you, you also are being impoverished. Most people going through divorce -- you know, some people are rich. But most people are pro se because they don't have the money.

Justice needs to be timely. Telling someone, well, we're going to schedule a hearing, and then you don't hear from them, and finally, it gets scheduled 10 months away, that's an eternity in the -- in a life of a child, and it's also an eternity if you're not getting child support.

One of the favorite things to do to the abusers -abusers do because they're mad they got left, so they're going
to do whatever they can do to get even, is don't pay child
support until you get the summons that we're going to go to
court to make you pay. So then the week before, you send the
checks.

However, right now, nobody assesses them a penalty for doing this. So meanwhile, the person who's supposed to get the child support has had to do without, go without paying

bills, hiring an attorney. It's just not fair. See, I should have put a 17th bill in that says you get penalty if you do this.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Well, that's it. And there isn't. There's your legislative efforts, and then there's what we're doing here, which is working within the system we've got and making recommendations for improvements. So you're right. There are two different efforts here.

MS. GAY: Super. And hopefully, we're reinforcing each other. I will try now to stop speaking sentences and just give you the bullets because they're so many more. Let's see. I said justice needs to be timely. I'll just throw out some little facts here.

16 times as many abusers lie as victims. When I presented last year, one woman on the children and family law actually said -- when I'm talking about abuse and testimony, she says, women lie. Oh, cool. All women lie, and men don't. Okay. There's -- there's the statistics. 16 times they -- as many abusers lie.

I do -- I will agree about creating some forms. And we have so many pro se people, and it's really hard on court people to deal -- court staff to deal with people who don't know proper procedures. It would be great to have, you know, a court procedures for dummies kind of book. So you have these options, and you know if you don't do this, you only

have 10 days to do this.

I have a bill that says you have a right to submit evidence in a hearing or testimony. Right now, in -- in the family law family rules, the only way you get to submit evidence is if the judge lets you. That's not a right.

Have the right to approve or choose a court-ordered counselor. These are your kids being sent to somebody that turns out, in some cases, these are friends, friends of the -- friends of the court, friends of the judge, friends of the GAL.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Well, and then our focus here is a little narrower than everything that goes on at family court, because I'm just kind of --

MS. GAY: Well, my concern, of course -JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Right.

MS. GAY: -- is DV. And what I was shocked to find out is if you -- if you allege that a domestic abuse is why you want a divorce, at least in my county, you automatically get sent to high-conflict court, which implies that you're fighting -- you know, two people are fighting each other. If you're a victim of domestic abuse, that is not an equal fight. You wouldn't be abused if you were equal.

One of my bills says, you have the right to -- a DV survivor has a right to have support person present with them when they're testifying or being deposed. That's because that

became aware of how -- how important that was when a person who already testified, who's the counselor, Dr. Rhonda Hodge, had a victim of DV who was so traumatized -- her PTSD was so strong that she could not go up by herself and depose with her abuser and his attorney present. She didn't have an attorney. And she was, emotionally, real close, even if she'd had an attorney.

The NHCADSV had provided a support person. And I know they can be wonderful. I have a dear friend who has been. But this person knew her counselor, and that was the only person she felt secure. The judge would not let her do that.

She said, I offered everything I could. I thought -- I said, okay, if I'm not looking at her, if I just go up with her, I hold her hand, I look away, would that be okay? Nope, he wouldn't do it. They had a ton of evidence of the domestic abuse. They wouldn't accept it unless she testified, so the guy walked, scot-free. And believe it or not, the NHCADSV sent somebody to testify against my bill. They did not want a person to have their friend, somebody close to them who reassured them. They did not want that. They only wanted one of their people.

A couple of the women who are on the committee -- I stayed afterward because it was lunchtime -- they could not believe that the NHCADSV was sending somebody that immune to



feelings.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Can we hear the rest of your recommendations?

MS. GAY: Limiting harassing or intimi -intimidating repeated court filings. You've heard -- you've
heard some testimony now about being dragged into court again
and again and again. We have -- we have RSAs. I thought it
was RSA. Maybe it's a court rule. But you can't go asking
for changes in child support, I thought, but every three
years. Does the -- some judges are allowing people to do this
every two months. Why?

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: And again, I'm just going to move things toward domestic violence, not --

MS. GAY: Okay.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: -- every other (indiscernible).

MS. GAY: Well, the trouble is, you know, you think if you get divorced that the DV stops. Sadly -- sadly, it goes, usually, until the youngest child -- for an abuser. I don't mean all people who this -- but in the case of domestic abuse, the abuse continues until the youngest child is 18 and child support stops.

And so this continued harassment is part of the DV.

You can keep people impoverished, and going to court

repeatedly is impoverishing. It interrupts with your work.

You can get fired for doing it. It interrupts with your personal business if you're running one. So it's -- it is DV. It's just continued.

Let's see. Relative to -- I've -- I've some really juicy bills. Relative to the procedures for guardian ad litem, okay, guardians ad litem are supposed to be the spokespeople --

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Right.

MS. GAY: -- of my understanding.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: And just because, again, your bills will have a legislative forum, we're focused on strictly domestic violence things today. So guardian ad litems are a little beyond our scope.

MS. GAY: Well, the tragedy is that sometimes they're abusers --

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Right.

MS. GAY: -- and you can't get rid of them. So I have a bill that says you could appeal because we know there is a guardian ad litem licensing board that you can appeal to. So far, we haven't heard of them doing anything when a guardian ad litem acts like they're supporting the parent paying them.

One woman told me, that -- that guardian ad litem saw my children for 20 minutes and then said they needed reunification therapy. She didn't even know them in 20



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

minutes. And it was then -- then the RT was very abusive. Yeah, I just said that. The GALs, the -- the bad ones are representing the parent paying them. I think -- I think I've given you, you know, 90 percent of what I've learned that needs to be addressed. thank you very much for being patient and caring. And, oh, I -- I'll make another promise. As a legislator, I will support increasing the budget. I have now recently learned that the budget for the courts got cut severely in 2010. And just like DCYF or DHHS, their budget got cut severely. And now that we have a child who was -- who is missing, and we have very little hope of finding her, maybe now we can get the attention of the people who will vote to increase the budget so we can hire adequate personnel. So thank you. JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you. Anyone in the audience who wants to speak but may not have signed up on a form? Any more forms? All right. We're going to suspend --MS. HORNICK: Justice, excuse me. JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Yes. MS. HORNICK: I believe one of the speakers said

> MS. HEIDEBRECHT: Yes. I didn't sign up. That's okay. Do we have JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI:

that there's someone else that you're aware of.

another speaker?

MS. HEIDEBRECHT: Sure.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Okay.

MS. HEIDEBRECHT: Thank you for forming this task force. My name is Sarah Heidebrecht. I am a mother of a six-year-old. And we live in Hanover, New Hampshire.

People often congratulate DV survivors for leaving. If you're a parent, as I know you've already heard, you never leave that situation entirely. I respectfully recommend that you consider some of the following points as you're working through your items.

One, that you would update the definition of abuse to include emotional abuse, course of control, and post-separation abuse. There is a post-separation abuse DV wheel. It somewhat mimics the really normal DV wheel that many of you have seen. But it's more specific to what happens after you have left your abuser. And I think it's really important that the judiciary is aware of what some of those behaviors are and what they might look like after you've left some of that initial relationship.

I ask that you create new legislature and laws that protect against child safety, emotional abuse, coercive control, and post-separation abuse, both in criminal cases and in family cases, and under that, that you somewhat abolish the term "high-conflict," which I think you've also heard that

implies that what is happening is the fault of both people.

And not to say, you know, everyone's a saint or a sinner in these cases. But predominantly, there's usually one person who is truly at fault.

That you require judges to notify survivors in all family cases that mediation isn't mandatory when there is a concern or finding of domestic violence. While I know it's written in the statute somewhere, that's not always clear to survivors on the front end. And attorneys are always game to push for mediation. And I feel like some of survivors' rights are lost that way because it's not explicitly clear that you do not have to attend mediation.

Protect survivors in discovery requests, including depositions, when a batterer attempts back-door access of prosecutorial information between cases.

Then tried to do some research on this because it happened to me. And in this case, my ex was trying to get information for his own civil case and criminal case. And because he couldn't get that from the prosecutor, he requested it from me through discovery and deposition, for his own purposes. And that was very traumatizing on me, and I also did not have the same access to a DV advocate or other attorney, you know, help with that to know how to stop that.

So I ask that you remove the friendly parent statute, which is -- I believe is 461-A:6(q). I'm not quite

sure why that statute was added, but often, DV survivors may not behave the same way towards their abuser as you would expect. You're not always going to be buddy-buddy and warm and fuzzy. And an abuser is very good at manipulation and very good at showing the face that needs to be shown in that moment.

And I think that statute penalizes the survivor because calling the police for a welfare check because you haven't heard how your sick child is for four days; you don't even know what -- you know, do they still have the fever, et cetera, et cetera, you know, the survivor is punished because that's viewed as, perhaps, invasive, yet they're not seeing kind of the lead-up as to why that, you know, you're not coming off as friendly. Like, you want to know if your child is well and alive.

And then mandate counseling between coparents, but the history of DV should never be ordered. In my own case, I was ordered to coparenting therapy with my abuser and threatened that I would lose time with my child, did I not seek this therapeutic intervention.

And I quote an order of the judge: "In keeping with the legislature's clear preference that the court support frequent and continued contact with both parents, the court hopes the parties work diligently to follow the GAL's lead to resolve their case therapeutically for the benefit of minor

child and so court is not forced to determine whether minor child should lose time with the parent."

And then point 3, educate judicial officials and professionals with modern research in child safety, domestic violence, course of control, et cetera, et cetera, such as the adverse childhood experiences study, ACEs; the Meyers (phonetic) study, which was sponsored by the U.S. Justice Department; the Sanders (phonetic) study, authored by Rosenfeld and Oberman; and the Santa Monica University study authored by Desap Sanders (phonetic), as well as there are other mechanisms abusers use, such as DARVO.

It's a acronym for deny, attack, reverse victim offender. It's a very common tactic used to kind of throw off -- you know, you claim something has happened. You say it. The abuser deflects that and blames you for something else. And all of a sudden, he or she looks like the victim. It happens a lot more frequently than you realize, until you understand what's going on.

And then consider implementing a domestic violencespecific court with highly trained professionals, as other
states have done. I think this would streamline some of the
congestion that is happening in the family court system, where
you have these, in some cases, highly complex cases that need
extra attention to move them along safely and effectively, but
they're not moving at all. And then you don't have the degree

of training with all of those judicial professionals that's needed. So I -- I know other states have done this successfully, so I hope you are able to look at that.

And then I ask that you improve the gender balance in all judiciary positions. I think that is just, like, so important. I mean, the -- the majority of this task force is women. Like, I don't -- you know, I don't know what that's saying. But is it because women care about this subject because it happens to them more often?

And then, you know, if our judges are predominantly male, like, are they going to care about it as often? I don't know. But equity is really important if we're representing a population that is roughly 50 percent male, 50 percent female.

And I ask that you update the protocol, licensing, and enforcement for batterers' intervention programs or therapists. In my case, my ex was ordered to batterers' intervention in his criminal case. He found a program in Vermont. We live right on the border. He was eventually terminated from that program due to multiple citations in his records, due to his behavior.

He enrolled in something that a therapist was offering in New Hampshire and passed her program in half the time mandated by the state's regulations. So I don't know how this happens. And you know, that was in his criminal case.

When it was brought to the attention of the family court

judge, they didn't care.

These interventions in criminal and -- and maybe in family cases are relying on programs which are not following the state's recommendation to address violent and abusive behaviors, predominantly in men and fathers. And you know, batterers' intervention itself is a whole another topic, and -- but if people are ordering that as part of a plea deal and it's not having the effect needed or desired or wanted, then it's like, what's the point? And then you're letting people back into the public who haven't completed, essentially, their, you know, jail time, except it's in -- in a program.

So and then I ask that you admonish attorneys and judicial officials and hold them to a higher standard for name-calling survivors in court, in motion practice, in correspondence, particularly in family court. Stop attorneys and judges from perpetrating false stereotypes. Report attorneys and judges for conduct and hold them accountable. And apply genuine consequences and recommendations when those are brought before the judicial review board.

Some of the comments that I have heard -- and these are just a few from an attorney -- hysterical, unhinged, woeful tale of victimhood; I have represented many true victims of real domestic abuse on many occasions; you are clearly not such a person.



From a judge, what type of DV are we talking about? I hear this stuff all day long.

From a GAL, he's just a knucklehead.

From a clerk, can't you have some humanity?

And I think for the clerk specifically, you know, what these people do all day long, I was a pro se litigant.

And so my Bible are the court rules. I mean, I know nothing else. It's walking into a foreign country. And so I'm trying to follow those rules to a T, while none of the other attorneys are. The clerks don't seem to care. And then I am punished for following the rules. And it -- I mean, it just makes no sense.

So yeah, and then also, I know this happens, but partner with DCYF to stop DV and post-separation abuse by investigating the -- a person if they're responsible for false accusations of child abuse.

Remove the DCYF anonymous number. I'm sure this has benefits and negatives, but when you are called in for a false accusation through the anonymous number, it's really awful, and especially when that likely happened by the abuser himself, you know, trying to get me in trouble.

Prosecute individuals who falsely report. And also -- this may be protocol but didn't happen in my case -- require police to immediately report to DCYF if a minor was present at a DV incident or arrest.



And then lastly, about the -- the gun statute, my ex's guns were removed at -- at the onset of the events in my case, when he was arrested. We're still in a case, four and a half years later, but the criminal case, I would much rather do anything in criminal court because there's actually factual evidence, and it legitimately moves through the system, but -- and perjury actually means something.

But to the gun statute, my ex, during this time, has applied to get his guns returned to him twice, both denied due to the federal statute and his actions. And so no one would really understand how threatening this might feel, that he knows what he did; he's admitted that he was at fault by pleading guilty, but because the court told him to, he put our protective order docket on the gun form, return of firearms form. And so I received a notification that he was requesting his firearms back, not the criminal case, where the police originally took the guns from.

And so there seems to be, like, a loophole there that's a little messed up. And I asked the judge to move it to the criminal docket, and they just ignored me. But I was personally sent both notices and -- and invited to attend, which I did.

He was denied. But you know, that strange occurrence, which no one would really foresee, like, it didn't allow me to have access to a criminal attorney, ask questions,

or a DV advocate, aside from our local organization like
the -- the county victim's advocate I'd worked with. You
know, like, it really -- it was just very confusing that the
return of firearms was only lodged under the protective order
docket.

So I just wanted to finish up and say Governor

Sununu proclaimed November this past year, in 2021, Family

Court Awareness Month. It's somewhat ironic that it didn't

garner any attention, but your task force was started in

November. And unfortunately, a child, Harmony, was lost or

reported lost in November. And I think what led to this task

force happened this fall.

So I just really appreciate the work you are all doing on this. I know there's a lot to do. But I hope some of these considerations will be reviewed. Thank you.

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Thank you very much. (Indiscernible).

Do we have any other people who would like to testify, give your statement? Any more sign-up sheets?

Then I believe --

MS. GAY: Ma'am, may I ask a question? If we have any -- oh, I'm sorry. If we have any material that we think is on your subject, is there any way to send it to you? Can we email it?

JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Absolutely. And there's a



```
form piece of paper out front.
1
 2
              MS. ZINKIN: Like this.
 3
              JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Looks like that.
 4
           Telephone call to the court information center toll-
 5
    free number.
 6
              MS. GAY: Okay. That's on here?
 7
              JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Email, comment email.
 8
    also with a stamp through the post office to the court here.
 9
              MS. GAY: Y'all must really pay attention to that
10
    because they're so rare, so --
11
              JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: It's true.
12
              MS. GAY: Thank you. Thank you.
13
              JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: You're welcome.
14
              Anyone else? Then I think we -- yes.
15
              MR. ALBRECHT: May I respectfully ask that you just
16
    read the email address for everyone for the record, for anyone
17
    listening? Thank you.
18
              JUSTICE HANTZ MARCONI: Does someone have -- thank
19
         dvtaskforcecomments -- all one word,
20
    dvtaskforcecomments@courts.state.nh.us.
21
              Okay. Then I think we will close the hearing, and
22
    thank you all very much. We very much appreciate your input
23
    and your comments. Thank you.
24
         (Proceedings concluded at 3:37 p.m.)
```



CERTIFICATE

I, Cheryl Odom, a court-approved proofreader, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, to the best of my professional skills and abilities.

TRANSCRIPTIONIST(S): Cheryl Odom, CDLT-186

Chery Digitally signed by Cheryl Odom Date: Odom 2022.03.25 17:06:02 -07'00'

CHERYL ODOM, CDLT-186
Proofreader

March 23, 2022



	•			i
A	86:17 88:2,4	act 15:11,25	93:12	aids 57:1
abilities 96:6	88:18 89:15	23:23 29:5	admonish 91:13	aiming 26:18
ability 8:11 34:3	92:20	33:14 62:10,11	admonishing	Airport 69:20
45:22 71:12	abusers 45:3	acting 31:23	32:21	Alan 8:14,15
able 5:18 8:8,9	73:11 76:8	action 24:25	advance 46:23	60:12
9:9 18:5 19:22	79:17,18 80:14	27:23	advantage 14:15	alarm 6:4
20:22,22 23:5	80:19 84:15	actions 93:10	14:16,22	Albrecht 23:15
23:6 34:5,10	89:11	activated 66:22	adverse 89:6	23:16,18 29:14
36:16 40:19	abusive 5:21	actively 20:6	advise 60:25	29:16 31:8
47:14 49:24	47:9 78:4 85:1	acts 12:22,23	71:4	43:15 95:15
56:23 90:3	91:4	32:22 33:11	advocacy 33:21	alcohol 38:11
abolish 86:24	academic 72:19	62:12 84:21	advocate 16:21	alienation 70:23
above-entitled	accept 52:20,20	actual 55:21	19:15 20:3	70:23
96:5	52:21 53:3	ad 15:5 18:1,5,6	31:14 32:17	alive 55:6 88:15
absolute 46:7	82:17	18:9,15,21	35:9 50:8	allegations
absolutely 18:4	access 2:18	25:22 33:2	87:22 94:1,2	33:17
18:7 40:8	17:13,14 28:10	49:18 67:25	advocates 2:19	allege 81:17
49:24 60:18	28:11 32:8	68:1 73:9 84:5	2:21 9:18	alleged 27:10,11
94:25	48:15 50:21	84:6,12,19,21	61:21	28:1 45:10
abuse 5:23 6:2	52:9 58:13	84:23	advocating 14:9	59:19 62:12
12:21 13:5	70:17 73:6	ADA 21:2,4	33:9 77:7	allotted 64:7
14:9 25:17	77:4 87:14,22	Adams 76:16	afford 49:24	allow 3:4,19
31:22 32:21,22	93:25	ADD 20:10	50:22 53:9	13:4 51:10
32:23,25 33:11	accessible 36:16	added 88:1	58:21 59:6	53:12 63:1
33:14,17 36:2	accident 19:3	addition 3:15	afoul 28:13	69:9 93:25
45:3 46:3,8	accommodati	53:22	afraid 34:17	allowed 11:18
54:13 61:24,25	21:2,5 64:23	additional 48:21	afternoon 2:5	12:19 32:1
62:8,21 63:2	accomplished	57:9 71:15	4:4 8:15 16:6	39:14 43:21
63:20 66:24	15:10	additionally	23:16 31:10	44:10 69:16
73:3 75:25	accountability	48:2	43:11 46:22	allowing 54:2
76:4,10,14,20	31:20 36:8,12	address 6:23 7:5	53:25 54:1,3	83:10
77:9 80:16	36:24	9:15 10:11	55:10 56:1	allows 45:22
81:17,21 82:17	accountable	12:5 20:14	57:14 60:21	61:10
83:21,21 86:12	36:3 40:22	54:2 55:12	64:18 65:7	alternative
86:13,14,14,22	73:11,11 75:17	62:7 66:5 91:4	66:5	44:12
86:23 91:24	91:18	95:16	afterward 82:24	alternatives
92:14,16	accusation	addressed 85:5	age 47:8	78:19
abused 5:25	92:19	adequate 58:5	agent 24:17	amazing 44:25
7:25 32:14	accusations	58:20 63:6,21	ago 15:20 16:8	52:6
36:24 65:21,21	26:15 92:16	65:1 85:14	22:10 34:25	Amendment
65:21 70:18	accused 17:25	ADHD 20:10	42:9 73:21	28:14 29:17
73:21 77:3	28:17 43:19	adjust 77:21	agree 10:20	43:1
78:5,10 79:8	45:4 70:22	adjusted 74:10	21:17,19 25:6	Amendments
81:22	ACEs 75:20,23	administration	67:19 80:20	29:9,12
abuser 7:20 10:5	89:6	55:21	agreed 41:10	American 28:16
11:21 47:16	achieve 47:17	admissibility	48:18,19 67:18	67:6
69:21 73:5,7	acknowledge	12:18	67:20	amount 41:10
77:2 78:7,18	73:9	admit 70:15	agreement 24:16	79:1
82:5 83:19	acronym 89:12	admitted 71:1	aid 59:4	and/or 57:19
04.3 03.19				
	1	<u>I</u>	I	I

				raye z
anecdotal 13:5	73:19 94:13	93:21	82:1 85:23	61:12
13:21	95:22	attended 69:1	86:18	batter 9:4
anecdotes 14:5	appreciation	attention 73:13	Awareness 94:8	battered 22:1
14:23 15:8	11:10	85:13 89:24	awful 74:19	batterer 87:14
Angela 42:7	approach 11:9	90:25 94:9	92:19	batterers' 90:15
angle 43:14	approached	95:9	AZ 1:18	90:16 91:6
angry 33:21	15:7 18:5,15	attorney 12:16		beat 43:19
animal 47:21	appropriate	18:12,14 21:17	B	bed 52:4 53:17
annoy 45:23	12:11 19:22	28:20 30:17	B-1/B-2 67:8	began 16:18
anonymous	appropriately	48:18 50:22	back 3:9,14 5:21	54:5
92:17,19	13:16	54:18,19 55:14	5:24 6:14,19	beginning 15:6
answer 46:13	approve 81:6	58:3 76:3 77:2	11:25 21:5	behalf 8:17,20
answered 74:15	approved 10:10	80:1 82:5,5,7	22:9 25:8	behave 88:2
anxiety 66:20	April 23:25	87:23 91:22	28:22 34:16	behavior 12:25
anxious 11:5	68:16,23 69:5	93:25	37:19 38:1,2,9	42:5 71:2 72:2
anymore 34:6	arbitrary 51:13	attorneys 2:21	39:15 43:23,25	90:20
76:21	area 20:13	9:18 14:20	47:20 51:8,18	behavioral 70:4
Anyway 75:10	arises 63:4	24:17 34:12,24	66:17,22 68:20	behaviors 45:10
AOC 64:6	arrest 38:17	87:9 91:13,16	71:13,16 74:10	86:18 91:5
apart 43:20 74:1	41:21 49:10	91:18 92:10	91:10 93:16	behest 9:6
apartment	92:25	audience 85:17	back-door 87:14	believe 26:8 36:7
14:15	arrested 23:24	audio 4:14 12:16	background	70:18 82:18,25
Apfel 53:24,25	38:16 76:13	15:8 16:7 22:2	7:24 23:19	85:22 87:25
apologize 46:23	93:3	26:12 29:3	26:4,19	94:20
58:8 64:12	arrival 67:11	35:5 38:8	bad 17:23 25:19	believed 22:4
appeal 23:20	article 30:16	42:12 57:7	28:9 39:13	believing 34:6
25:12 39:11	74:16	58:16,23 64:12	42:4 45:10	bench 57:12
44:12 51:15	Ashley 46:21	64:19	54:25 55:1,5,9	75:18
78:15 84:18,19	aside 94:1	August 38:2	55:9 61:18	benefit 33:25
appear 59:20	asked 2:10 22:12	39:6 48:9	72:16 74:21	88:25
appearance	46:11 48:8,15	69:20	75:15 85:2	benefits 92:18
55:20	57:24 93:19	Austin 31:9,10	badly 46:17	berate 72:8
appeared 67:12	asking 60:4 75:7	31:12 34:3	bags 22:25	berated 69:6
appellate 2:15	83:8	authored 89:8	bailiffs 14:18	70:22
26:23,24 29:25	aspect 19:19,19	89:10	balance 90:4	best 5:13,14
54:8	48:11	autistic 20:10	balancing 15:11	8:11 15:7
Apple 7:17,17	assesses 79:23	automatically	15:25	22:13,13 25:22
7:17	assigned 18:1	22:20 81:18	bankrupt 72:13	30:9 32:18
apples 74:22	associate 2:6	available 2:17	baptism 74:18	35:10 49:21
applied 13:12	56:11	2:25 3:18,22	Baptist 24:4	57:12 75:22
93:9	Association 8:17	13:16 23:3	Bar 58:16 59:20	96:5
apply 49:12	58:16 59:20	26:23 49:2	Barry 76:3	better 2:13 8:6
91:19	assumptions	65:2	based 6:1 13:5	Betty 73:15
applying 13:10	44:22	avoid 13:4 63:11	14:2 25:17	beyond 49:6
appoint 25:22	astounded 49:1	awarded 44:2,9	38:24 39:1,11	84:13
appointed 36:20	attack 89:12	66:24	40:2 44:21	bias 22:20 36:1
36:25	attempts 87:14	aware 3:7 13:8	basically 25:2	Bible 92:7
appreciate 23:9	attend 24:4,22	57:1 58:9	basis 23:6 52:10	big 52:19
31:18 46:19,19	68:14 87:12	65:17 74:12	56:17 57:11,24	bigger 61:22
	•	<u> </u>	1	ı

				Page 3
bill 77:24 80:2	26:24 30:16		46:7 48:23	certification
81:2 82:19	37:2 45:16	$\frac{\mathbf{C}}{\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{V} \mathbf{C}}$	51:22 52:14	78:24
84:18	55:13,14,15,16	California 24:24	57:22,25 64:16	certifications
bills 39:16 77:20	58:12 60:8	29:2 76:6	83:20 87:17,18	70:11
78:19 80:1	Branch's 3:2	call 3:16,24 7:20	87:18 88:17,25	certified 72:20
81:23 84:5,11	break 12:1	32:13 69:9	90:16,17,24	72:20 77:14
biolog 67:7	45:23 76:18	95:4	92:23 93:3,3,4	79:4
biological 16:16	breaking 40:17	call-back 3:19	93:16	certify 96:3
67:8	breaks 75:15	call-in 3:21	caseloads 64:7	cetera 88:11,11
bipolar 20:18	76:12	called 7:5 28:12 38:4 40:24	cases 2:7,12 6:3	89:5,5
birds-eye 19:21	brief 23:19	67:23 68:9	8:19 9:20,25	chair 2:6
birth 48:8	29:25 32:3		11:22,23 12:6	challenge 57:18
birthday 66:19	bring 31:19	72:6,10 74:13 92:18	14:3,25 21:20	57:18
72:9	42:23		23:4,5,5 26:13	challenges 9:12
bit 26:23 37:14	bringing 33:16	calling 25:25 40:25 88:8	26:15 29:7,18	champion 46:8
47:1	brings 37:19	40:25 88:8 calls 3:19 34:21	30:3,23 34:22	chance 35:12
bitter 22:2	broad 3:5	calm 70:24	35:23 36:1,15	change 21:6,15
blamed 5:17	broke 17:19	caim 70:24 capability 17:16	45:21,25 52:10	22:8 36:6
blames 89:15	24:11 47:18	capabile 18:2	52:11 54:13	47:12 52:20
blank 27:10	50:23 73:25	capable 18.2 capacity 19:25	55:19 56:13	changed 34:1
blatant 36:1	broken 35:19	30:4	57:19 59:6,17	52:5 58:17
blessing 74:5	brought 7:25	car 19:3 38:6,9	59:23 60:14,18	72:19
blew 71:3	22:12 33:12	38:11	61:3 63:10	changes 13:20
block 71:12	35:13 38:12	Carbon 57:19	64:4,5,7,14	52:8 83:9
blood 38:13	48:23 68:20	card 45:16	78:20 81:8	characterized
blurs 27:21	90:25 91:20	care 7:23 50:19	86:23,24 87:3	15:11
board 84:19	Bruce 25:24	72:16 73:19	87:6,15 89:23	charge 48:4
91:20	bruises 76:20,21	75:12 90:8,11	89:23 91:3	59:20
body 47:22	brush 74:21	91:1 92:10	categories 55:3	charged 47:23
bold 4:13	buddy-buddy	cared 37:23	cause 34:17	59:22
book 76:13,17	88:3	career 5:11 54:5	caused 12:25	charges 24:14
80:24	budget 85:8,9	72:18	34:19 35:21	charts 70:4
books 76:4	85:10,14	caretaking	38:21 40:20	cheating 38:3,3
boots 5:20	building 44:25	18:24	41:24 44:24	38:5
border 57:7	bullet 74:11	caring 37:24	causes 12:25	check 27:8 88:8
90:18	bullet-pointed	85:6	CDLT-186 96:7	check-off-the
borderline 20:19	46:24	cars 7:18	96:15	57:8 62:13
38:18	bullets 12:17	case 6:12 11:11	cell 67:16	checked 38:6,14
Boston 66:17,20	80:11	14:2 15:23	center 3:16 76:6	38:14
66:25 68:2	bunch 25:25	16:15 17:10	95:4	checks 79:22
69:20	burden 30:19	18:2,17 23:20	centers 22:15,25	Cheryl 96:2,7,15
boxes 27:8	burdens 64:23	23:24 25:23	35:4	Chewbacca
boys 66:13,25	burned 34:10	28:23,23 29:1	central 32:19	37:11
67:7,15 71:25	business 37:21	29:11,20,23	certain 64:18	Chief 66:10
72:3,7	39:9 43:17,17	32:12,19,20	certainly 52:15	child 6:7 16:24
boys' 67:7 68:24	43:19 51:6	34:20 35:2,8	56:1 59:2,7	18:20,23 19:1
70:25 71:11,20	65:15 84:2	35:15 39:5,15	65:12	19:2,3,11,19
brain 19:3	buy 7:6	39:18,19,23	certificate 48:8	20:6,9 22:14
branch 2:25		40:2,13 44:4	96:1	22:24 31:13,18
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 4
31:24,25 32:9	Christmas 72:9	76:24 77:2	2:22 73:3	congestion
32:12,14,17,19	church 10:5	coercive 86:22	communities	89:22
32:21,22 33:1	18:15 24:4,6	collaborative	8:25	congratulate
33:3,9,11 34:4	24:22 25:4,5	22:16	community	86:7
34:5,9 38:22	25:12,16 28:2	collected 3:10	22:13 56:12	Connecticut
39:11,16 40:2	42:11,18,20	36:14	57:7	18:18 54:6
44:11 48:15	70:13	collection 73:23	COMPANY	cons 59:7
49:21 50:3	circled 43:18	Columbia 29:18	1:17	consensual 44:4
52:3,6 62:25	Circuit 2:11	combined 12:24		consent 10:18
66:21 68:10,10	35:24 57:12	13:15	competing 9:7 complaint 57:23	
69:10 70:12		come 3:24 5:4	_	consequences 55:22 91:19
	circulating 4:4 citation 27:17	8:9 11:25 25:8	complete 2:24 28:16 38:15	
73:2 79:15,16				consider 12:22
79:19,25 83:9	citations 90:19	39:24 42:9	69:15	43:15 53:10
83:19,21,22	citizen 16:9 67:6	46:12 49:22	completed 91:10	86:10 89:19
85:11 86:22	citizens 30:23	51:10,17 52:19	completely 26:2	consideration
88:9,14,19	36:10	53:21 55:10	28:19 44:3	12:15,20 23:22
89:1,2,4 92:16	city 76:15	59:8 61:7	45:14	26:20
94:10	civil 2:16 27:22	77:24 78:6	complex 5:2 9:7	considerations
child's 32:21	45:1 46:11	comes 65:16	55:4 89:23	94:15
33:5 51:13	59:5 65:5	comfortable	comply 56:20	consistent 13:12
childhood 89:6	87:18	4:14,16	68:19	consists 54:9
children 8:2	claim 89:14	coming 4:14	composes 62:8	constant 41:17
15:24 16:1,23	claimed 70:10	16:8 49:18	concept 19:18	constantly 4:21
20:12 24:1,6	claims 21:21	64:17 65:10	conceptually	5:8 58:23
35:13 36:10	Claremont	88:14	62:18	constants 34:13
38:8 40:1,1,9	57:20	commence 2:1	concern 12:5	Constitution
41:17,24 45:13	class 46:10	comment 3:9	55:23,24 65:1	28:15 29:9
56:9 60:2	47:23	10:3 95:7	81:14 87:7	Constitutional
61:14,15,16	Clause 28:14	comments 3:12	concerned 28:11	29:7 45:1
65:20 67:19	clear 33:8 35:13	53:22 91:21	40:12 43:5	50:16 55:23
68:16,18 69:6	60:24 62:13	95:23	56:21 61:4	contact 14:12
69:7,8,10,16	63:13 87:8,11	commission	concerning	15:23 19:2
69:18,22 70:7	88:22	54:20	25:24	25:18 34:22
70:18 71:13	clearly 30:7 73:1	commitment	concerns 33:12	47:25 48:17
72:8,14,14	91:25	9:11	concluded 95:24	60:19 61:24
73:6,10,12	clerk 54:5 92:4,5	committed	concluding 9:21	67:15,25 68:5
75:13,19,19,21	clerks 14:18	23:23 27:18	conclusion 49:3	88:23
75:22 76:8	92:10	28:1	CONCORD 1:1	contacted 50:7
77:8 80:15	client 10:4 11:13	committee 9:2,5	condition 49:8	contain 39:10
84:24	11:19	9:10 10:11	conditions 47:24	contained 39:3
children's 66:20	clients 11:9	14:3,6 15:12	48:16	contains 13:3
67:22,23 68:2	14:20 19:11	23:17 26:8	conduct 12:9,14	contempt 69:12
68:6,8 69:11	close 82:6,21	33:23 37:9,16	12:19,24 13:6	contempts 71:15
69:14,21	95:21	46:14 54:1	13:7,10 33:22	contend 29:19
China 24:25	Clothesline	58:17 82:23	91:18	contentious
choice 75:11	21:24,25	common 89:13	confidence 26:2	32:13 35:25
choose 3:9 81:6	coach 72:21	communicate	confidentiality	context 23:19
chose 49:14	code 78:25	61:11 73:4	7:5	35:1 63:2,9
Christine 66:8	coercion 76:23	communication	confusing 94:3	contexts 64:9
L	•	•	•	•

				Page 5
continuations	counciling 41.4	30.7 10 11 12	86:21	77:19
60:15	counseling 41:4 78:7 79:2	39:7,10,11,12 39:18,20,22,24	86:21 created 21:24	custody 16:14
continue 6:2	88:16	40:21 41:21,22	22:19 77:7	18:22 19:6
61:6	counselor 66:10	47:6 48:17,23	creates 13:2	32:12 66:25
continued 34:20	68:25 71:24	49:4,9,10 50:7	58:10	71:8 75:11
50:25 83:23	81:7 82:2,10	50:23 51:1,11	creating 15:12	78:18
84:3 88:23	counselors 69:1	51:18 52:13	46:3 80:20	cut 85:9,11
continues 71:12	69:13 73:8	56:15 57:3,12	creation 14:2	cut 83.9,11 cutting 17:20
83:21	counter-paren	59:25 60:9,23	credence 74:16	cutting 17.20
continuing	73:2	61:10 63:18	credible 12:9	D
78:21	country 17:22	66:25 67:5,10	32:25 62:16	D 30:5
contracting	36:19 66:16,21	67:12,13 68:1	64:25 70:6,10	D.C 29:21
43:17	66:22 67:5	68:14,19 69:14	70:14	dads 5:22,23
control 45:11	70:9,19 76:7	69:15 70:1,6	crime 13:2 54:11	DalPra 25:24
86:13,23 89:5	92:8	72:12,15,16	crimes 27:17,21	43:23
controlling 29:5	county 48:18	73:22 74:19,20	27:25 28:13	damage 34:17
46:4,4	54:19 66:25	75:25 76:5,19	criminal 2:20	damaging 77:9
conversations	81:18 94:2	76:23 77:22	8:17,18 9:20	Dana 23:15,17
14:18 15:4	County's 71:7	79:21 80:21,22	9:21,23 12:8	42:7,9
58:23	couple 42:8	80:24 81:9,13	14:3 19:19	danger 41:9
convicted 18:17	82:23	81:19 83:5,6,8	24:14 27:22	62:16 64:25
19:6,7 34:11	course 14:24	83:24 88:22,23	30:11,13 32:6	65:2
cool 80:17	42:12 44:11	89:1,20,22	54:10 62:10,11	dangerous 4:21
cooling- 61:8	61:15 75:9	90:25 91:15,16	86:23 87:18	32:4 56:6
coordinators	81:14 86:13	92:7 93:5,13	90:17,24 91:2	darkness 35:18
39:19	89:5	94:8 95:4,8	93:4,5,16,20	DARVO 89:11
coparent 73:4,4	court 1:1 2:6,10	court's 2:7 12:14	93:25	data 13:22 15:8
coparenting	2:12,17 3:14	12:20 44:23	criminally 59:22	36:14 63:9
68:15,23 69:4	3:16,22 4:24	court-approved	crisis 8:5 17:14	date 51:4,8
69:7 70:5	5:9,9 6:5 8:1	1:20 96:2	21:11 22:15,25	56:22
88:18	9:2,17 10:1,1,6	court-ordered	35:4 72:22	dated 12:14,18
coparents 88:16	10:9,10,16,16	71:13,22 81:6	criteria 2:15	12:18,19
correct 30:9	11:8,20 12:12	courtroom	46:3 62:17	dating 32:8
96:3	12:21 13:4,10	32:18 33:22	critical 75:25	daughter 16:11
correlation	14:15,18 15:4	courts 2:20 13:3	Cronheim 8:14	16:14,20 19:8
20:11,12	15:19 16:23,24	15:3 17:6	8:15,16 15:17	38:9 48:6
correspondence	17:12,18,21	20:14 26:11	21:18 60:12	49:19 50:13
91:16	18:2,3,4,6,9,14	36:18 37:4	65:13	52:5,16 53:12
corroborated	18:18,22 19:10	39:3 63:8 73:5	cross 63:6	53:14
33:18	19:10,12,16,17	75:21 85:9	cross-examina	daughter's
couch 3:6	19:23 21:1,3	cover 18:15 50:2	11:6,21	16:16 50:19
councils 22:12	22:3 23:7,20	coverage 78:25	cross-examining	daughters 19:7
22:16,19,22	24:1 25:13,20	covered 12:7	57:3	Dave 10:2 42:7
23:1	27:6,7,14,19	covers 79:6	cruelty 66:24	43:10
counsel 2:19	28:6 29:21	CPAP 69:11	current 2:14,19	day 13:3 19:11
28:11,12 58:13	30:22 31:16,16	crazy 8:1 22:2	12:7 62:9	25:2,8,17,18
61:11 67:17	33:9 35:21,24	create 9:8 11:6	currently 17:7	29:11 38:6
70:21 71:15	37:14,15,22	21:14 22:12	29:20 35:3	41:16 44:11
72:14	38:23 39:2,6,6	37:2 45:7	36:2 46:1 54:4	50:19 51:4,6

				Page 6
51:11,15 53:11	54:10,16,17	deserve 30:25	38:9	dicturbing 75.7
55:4,4 61:5,5	56:7,12 57:1,3	design 27:7	disagreeing	disturbing 75:7 diversity-of-ci
65:19,19 71:12		design 27:7 desired 91:8	25:10	28:25
/	58:4,14 59:14			
77:20 92:2,6	59:22 65:22	desperately 37:5	disappearing	division 45:18
days 10:14,20	defender 54:7	despite 32:25	67:16	divorce 13:16
51:7 53:3	54:18	44:1 51:1 68:9	disappointment	14:22 21:20
68:21 70:21	defense 2:21	69:18 70:2	19:14	25:7,23 38:21
81:1 88:9	8:17,18 37:11	77:19	disbelieved	40:18 41:4
DCI 38:16	60:4	Detailed 3:20	21:23	44:2 45:17
DCYF 33:18	define 62:22	detective 44:16	discern 27:19	54:14 63:10
38:16 39:8	63:17,20 76:22	determine 89:1	28:3	65:3 66:23
40:13 41:10	defined 13:10	determining	disclosures 33:1	72:21 77:1
67:23 70:4	defining 12:21	12:15	discontinuing	79:9 81:18
85:10 92:14,17	definitely 4:11	detriment 40:6,7	69:4	divorced 52:17
92:24	definition 13:5	devastated	discovery 87:13	66:14 83:18
deal 47:24 51:25	13:11,12 62:8	18:24	87:20	doable 10:9
51:25 52:19	62:9 86:12	develop 56:24	discuss 14:8	docket 25:13
61:18 80:22,22	deflects 89:15	developed 57:8	15:18 46:13	27:3 29:21
91:7	degree 89:25	developing 57:2	64:16 76:23	93:14,20 94:5
dealing 55:4	delimited 42:24	59:11	discussed 29:11	dockets 39:3,10
60:22 61:4	delivered 50:7	developmental	47:2	39:10
62:3 79:8	69:6	5:6,6	discussion 12:13	doctor 6:16
dealt 17:10	demanding	deviations 39:4	45:2 57:14	15:14 20:11
48:18 50:8	43:22,22 61:14	devices 7:15	60:3 62:20	69:11
dear 82:9	demonstrate	DHHS 85:10	71:10	Doctors 66:10
December 39:2	12:24	diagnosed 20:18	discussions 70:3	documentation
decide 57:25	denial 14:3	38:19	disinterest 44:23	71:23 73:1
decided 22:18	55:23	diagnoses 20:16	dismissed 24:7	documented
28:23 34:25	denied 13:23,24	die 20:6,7	disorder 5:3	32:23
56:17 64:5	14:1 15:1 21:4	died 42:8	20:19,20 38:19	documents
decision 26:16	21:23 26:10	difference 35:16	dispose 47:22	17:21 58:8
26:24 48:24,25	58:5 93:9,23	different 21:7	dispute 10:15	doing 5:14 26:12
50:7 51:2	deny 44:7 89:12	25:8 28:2	dissatisfaction	30:19 40:16
decision-maki	denying 36:17	43:14 59:9	55:25	58:11,13 61:22
71:9,10 76:1	63:14	74:4 80:8	dissemination	79:24 80:6
decisions 2:15	department	differently 45:8	44:22	84:1,20 94:14
5:18 9:17	44:14 89:8	difficult 5:18	dissociation	dollar 73:23
26:23 28:9	departments	8:22 9:1 11:20	70:2	dollars 78:11
36:9,21 76:11	22:23 30:18	14:7 16:1	distinction	domestic 1:5 2:7
decline 62:23	depends 61:15	17:17 63:17,23	27:22	2:12,13,14,16
deeply 73:19	depose 82:4	64:9	distress 65:6	2:17,18,21
defect 45:9	deposed 81:25	digging 6:14,19	distribution	4:15,20 8:23
defendant 10:19	deposition 87:20	diligent 4:12	9:17	9:2,5,10 12:7
10:25 11:15	depositions	diligently 88:24	district 9:2	13:14 14:9
14:13 15:23	87:14	direct 32:25	10:16 18:18	15:21 16:22
27:9,18,18	deprived 57:17	36:21	29:18 54:6	17:8,13 20:13
65:24	Derby 24:21	directly 3:5	68:3	21:18,22 22:14
defendants 8:20	25:11 27:15	26:20	distrust 56:3	22:21,24 23:4
10:22 15:9	Desap 89:10	disability 37:23	disturbed 27:15	24:13 25:16
	_			
	•	•	•	•

				Page 7
26:6,14 27:16	95:20	72:23	especially 26:6	30:13 33:6
28:18 31:11,12		emotional 41:23	28:12 31:1	53:15 54:19
31:20,22 34:23	E	63:19 65:6	45:5 64:4	76:22
35:10,18,25	earlier 12:13	86:13,22	92:20	example 62:20
36:14,15 40:23	44:6 60:12	emotionally 33:7	essentially 7:12	77:5
44:17 47:5	early 51:10	65:20 82:6	25:11 91:11	excessive 79:5
48:2 54:11	earn 56:10	empathy 47:1	estate 6:24	exchange 45:11
56:15 58:4	earned 62:23	employment	24:17	exchanges 44:11
59:19 60:15	easier 68:22	56:10	et 88:10,11 89:5	excited 19:17
62:4,25 64:11	easily 44:19	enablers 45:22	89:5	exculpatory
75:25 76:4,10	East 24:25	encourage 10:17	eternity 79:15	57:2
76:14,20 81:17	easy 9:16 26:25	encouraged 3:11	79:16	excuse 53:4
81:21 82:17	45:11	ended 34:20	evaluated 32:23	85:20
83:13,20 84:12	echo 43:15	endorsed 10:8	evaluation 36:13	Executive 55:14
87:7 89:4,19	economic 63:9	ends 56:15	even- 55:16	exist 45:24
91:24	63:14	endured 75:4	61:18	expanded 13:5
door 27:3 42:19	educate 89:3	enforcement	even-handed	62:8
42:20,21	educated 8:8	2:20 90:15	55:12,20,22,24	expansion 12:6
double 17:22,23	70:17	enforcing 76:15	56:19,20 58:11	expect 3:6 4:25
DOVE 59:21	education 22:17	engage 57:13	event 35:13	76:11 88:3
Dr 4:6,7,8 8:13	effect 91:8	English 17:11,19	events 11:6	expense 45:12
62:2 82:2	effectively 62:9	17:23	25:17 27:11	expenses 45:12
Dracut 24:5	89:24	English-speak	28:24 93:2	experience 11:2
dragged 83:6	effort 22:17	17:16	eventually 90:18	12:1 19:24
dreads 23:5	efforts 33:21	enjoy 43:12	everybody 30:22	21:21 25:19
drove 47:21	80:5,8	enormous 36:20	53:8 74:14	31:16,19,23
drugs 38:11	eight 38:10 44:6	55:23	75:1 76:1	33:23 35:3
drunken 22:2	47:19	enormously	everyone's 87:2	52:6 54:13,13
due 9:13 45:8	eight-year-old 38:21	36:23	evidence 12:18	70:12 74:4
55:23 59:17	either 15:9 57:2	enrolled 90:21	12:22 13:5,21	experienced
66:19 72:2	61:24 75:10	ensure 36:23	32:24,25 41:2	33:16 36:4
90:19,20 93:9	elderly 37:25	enter 10:2	44:8 57:2,9	experiences 47:6
dummies 80:24	41:18,24	entered 11:17	63:8 64:22	89:6
dust 37:3	electronic 1:20	entire 49:20	81:3,5 82:16	expertise 37:1,5
DV 23:19 24:2	96:4	entirely 17:3	93:6	experts 33:18
24:20 25:21	element 62:15	28:2 59:9 86:9	evil 44:19 ex 24:10 32:15	36:13
29:18 30:3,6,6 41:20 42:10,19	elements 13:3	entry 38:25 enumerated	38:2,4,24 40:4	explain 49:21 explained 49:11
43:6 44:5,9,21	eliminate 45:17	62:10	40:10 41:7	explicitly 87:11
66:10 75:21	62:17	epidemic 14:24	56:17 57:24	extend 10:20
81:16,23 82:3	else's 53:14	14:25	67:24 73:22	extended 10:18
83:18,23 84:2	email 3:11 23:10	equal 15:13	87:17 90:16	10:23 11:11
86:7,14,15	24:11 67:17	28:13 81:21,22	93:8	extending 40:6
87:22 88:1,17	71:3,24 94:24	equipped 20:14	ex's 93:2	extending 40.0
92:1,14,25	95:7,7,16	equipped 20:14 equitable 45:18	ex-boyfriend	53:4
94:1	emailed 68:9	equity 60:23	6:13	extensions 11:23
dvtaskforceco	emailing 71:2	90:12	ex-wife 19:8	extent 10:15
95:19	emergency	Erica 31:9,12	exactly 16:12	63:25
dvtaskforceco	13:23 67:24	eScribers 1:17	22:7 27:9,13	extra 8:3 89:24
		1.17		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	I	I	I

				Page 8
extreme 35:23	16:25 17:7	fear 13:1 14:13	14:1 26:4	focus 15:19
44:16 45:25	21:12,15 40:6	34:4,10,15	56:25 70:5	81:11
46:3	42:24 62:6	46:4,6	71:9,14	focused 84:11
	76:21	February 68:16	finalized 51:3	focusing 9:20
F	family 6:14 8:1	68:18,23	finally 16:13	16:3
F 25:24	10:16 14:15	federal 28:14	18:25 19:4	folks 12:3 17:4
face 18:16 88:5	15:4 16:23,24	29:4,5,23 54:5	24:7 30:1	follow 14:3,22
facilitate 58:12	17:6,12,18	93:10	47:14 71:1	76:11,17 88:24
facing 11:20	19:10,10,12,15	feel 4:14,16 5:13	79:14	92:9
fact 18:10,11	19:17,20,23	20:25 23:11,12	financial 6:22	followed 71:18
19:1 20:20	20:14,25 21:2	34:5 37:10,10	39:25 40:8,10	71:19
21:21 32:7,22	21:7 22:12	53:21 61:14	62:21 63:2,5	following 51:6
42:25 44:17	23:1,24 24:1	87:10 93:11	76:22	86:10 91:3
49:1 60:13	25:20 29:1	feeling 31:25	financially 33:7	92:11
68:9 69:18	32:12 34:12,20	49:20	49:15,16 53:9	follows 14:12
70:12	39:1,19,22	feelings 83:1	find 4:23 7:16	forbid 53:14
facts 5:4 27:11	40:11,17 41:17	feels 5:2	16:19 18:12	force 1:5 2:7,9
27:19 56:24	42:2 43:2 48:1	feet 24:23	20:22 26:25	2:24 3:12,19
80:13	49:23 61:10	fell 43:20 51:4	30:14,20 61:12	3:20 23:22
factual 93:5	62:24 66:25	71:3	81:16	26:21 30:3,12
fail 26:12 56:22	67:5 69:18	felonies 47:23	finding 25:16	30:18 31:11
failing 13:17	73:22 74:19	felony 48:4	85:12 87:7	55:14,15,15
16:25 17:7	75:21 77:12,13	felt 45:14 49:1	findings 60:14	56:19,21 57:5
19:25 55:22	77:22 80:15	49:20 82:11	fine 68:14	58:14 59:8,24
failings 15:19	81:4,4,13	female 5:24	finish 94:6	60:4,8 62:21
failure 35:20	86:24 87:6	90:13	firearm 41:22	66:10 68:18
failures 36:4	89:22 90:25	fever 88:10	firearms 41:13	86:5 90:6 94:9
fair 4:23 23:8	91:3,16 94:7	field 36:14	41:16,18,19	94:12
55:16,20,21,24	far 32:20 84:20	fight 21:5 33:5	93:14,16 94:4	forced 18:19
56:20 58:10	Fatality 9:10	49:17 50:22	fired 84:1	19:2 32:10,16
59:16 80:1	father 16:16,18	81:21	first 4:6 5:10 9:2	40:4 69:8 89:1
fairly 64:18	18:17,19 23:25	fighting 35:11	9:4,16 16:13	foregoing 30:8
fairness 9:13	32:21 33:4	81:20,20	19:15 23:19	96:3
18:12	66:14,15 67:5	figure 45:19	25:21 29:8,11	foreign 66:16
faith 33:14 36:5	67:8,12 68:8	63:23 76:24	37:9,20 49:22	70:19 92:8
fake 40:24,25	68:15,19,24	file 39:8 47:15	52:12 62:10	forensic 33:18
fall 26:18 30:19	69:2,5,17	49:14 51:17	65:24 67:13,22	foresee 93:24
94:12	70:19,25 71:11	52:22 72:11	first-degree	forever 34:1,10
false 18:4 24:14	71:18 72:1	filed 10:1 13:23	28:17	34:13
26:15 30:5,10	father's 70:9	24:25 48:9	firsthand 34:9	forget 7:5
38:4,15,20	71:14,24	66:23 67:4,24	fit 41:10	form 3:21 27:7
40:13,14,23	father-in-law	71:15	fitness 35:6	30:6,6 62:13
41:15 42:10,19	44:1	files 23:7	five 24:2 47:21	72:11 75:19
43:6 44:22	fathers 91:5	filing 10:14	67:3 71:15	85:18 93:14,15
91:17 92:15,18	fault 72:8 87:1,4	12:23	78:1	95:1
falsely 92:22	93:12	filings 83:5	five-year 50:24	former 24:3
familiar 48:10	favor 77:11	fill 3:10 27:11	fix 28:4 39:6	formerly 24:24
76:3	favorite 77:6	final 10:13,24	flagrant 44:23	forming 86:4
families 5:21	79:17	11:13,17,25	fled 16:8	forms 2:17 27:6

				Page 9
30:5,6 53:6	39:18 40:7	gathering 37:3	goal 26:13 47:17	Governor 94:6
57:8 58:24	front 4:3 51:9	Gay 73:15,16	65:10	grand 46:8
80:20 85:18	57:11 59:24	80:9 81:14,16	God 53:14	grant 18:23
60:20 83:18 forth 68:21	64:17 69:7	83:4,14,17	goes 5:23 26:5	grant 18:25 granted 14:25
	73:10 77:20	84:9,14,17	50:19 81:12	21:4 26:9,15
forthcoming 49:7	78:70 77:20 78:7 87:9 95:1	94:21 95:6,9	83:19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
49: / fortunate 32:11	fruitless 47:13	94:21 95:6,9 95:12	83:19 going 3:7 4:12	26:16,17 47:15 48:3
36:25	frustration		going 3: 7 4:12 5:10,21,24 6:1	
	19:14	gender 90:4	, ,	granting 12:12
forum 59:23 84:11	fuels 35:18	general 30:20 38:12 55:14	6:17 7:10,10	grateful 31:21 34:13
			7:11,11 8:5,10	
forums 65:1	full 10:1 11:8,12	General's 30:17	10:3,11 19:17	graves 6:14,19
forward 2:23	16:14 18:21	generally 45:23	19:21 22:7,17	great 8:18 11:3
12:4 33:16	19:6 70:2	gentlemen 66:11	24:23 28:5,22	15:19 19:14
fought 50:14	fully 6:4 9:17	genuine 91:19	30:7 39:15,20	23:14 73:16
52:4	18:2 20:4	getting 11:7	39:21 46:25	74:16 80:23
found 17:16	function 58:18	30:22 64:8	57:25 59:4,8	greatly 76:14
32:25 38:2,5	functional 10:9	79:16	61:5,6 62:5,14	groomed 47:8
38:11,17 44:5	fundamental	Gideon 28:20	63:2,25 64:3,3	ground 5:20
44:6 47:8,10	29:7	gifts 72:9	65:18 70:21	grounds 43:6
68:11 74:22,24	fundamentalist	Girard 37:7,8	74:10,24 75:10	63:21
90:17	24:4	42:14,16,18	75:14,19 78:15	group 2:24
foundation	funding 21:9	43:9	78:15,17,18	36:13 45:7
39:23	funds 18:15	girls 37:21,22	79:5,7,9,13,18	grow 32:10
four 23:25 34:25	funeral 42:9,19	give 32:3 33:11	79:20 83:12,24	53:12 75:22
39:11,24 48:21	42:20	35:11 37:17	85:19 88:3	guarantee 11:3
78:8 88:9 93:3	funerals 39:15	41:5 42:10	89:18 90:11	guardian 18:1,5
four-day 71:22	furious 33:8	43:23 50:4	gold 26:17 30:21	18:6,9,15,21
Fourteenth 29:8	72:1	52:8,21 63:6	Goldstein 76:4	25:22 33:2
29:11	further 34:17	74:12 75:11,14	good 2:5 5:16	49:18 67:25
fraud 44:15	36:2 46:14	78:19 80:11	8:15 16:6	68:1 73:9 84:5
free 3:17 23:11	50:1	94:19	17:24 23:16	84:12,19,21,23
23:12 47:14	fuzzy 88:4	given 17:14 20:1	31:10 33:14	guardians 15:5
53:21 95:5		44:7 47:24	37:21 39:9	84:6
freed 19:4	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G} + \mathbf{G}}$	49:5 78:18	40:23 42:22,23	guess 25:10
freedom 43:1	GA 6:1	85:4	43:11 44:12,19	30:12
46:5	gain 14:16 45:16	gives 25:24	45:24 46:22	guide 56:24
frequent 88:23	gaining 35:5	glasses 74:9	53:25,25 55:5	guilty 46:2
frequently 12:2	GAL 68:13 69:1	glorifiers 45:22	55:9 57:9	93:13
12:2 89:17	69:13,14 70:1	go 5:8,9 10:5	61:17 62:12	gun 73:23 93:1,8
Friday 3:18	70:5,7,10,16	11:19 21:5,20	66:7 73:18	93:14
friend 25:22	81:10 92:3	27:3,3 41:11	75:5,18 77:2	gunpoint 47:19
70:13 74:23	GAL's 88:24	41:22 42:20,24	88:4,5	guns 38:6,7,11
82:9,20	GALs 33:18	44:10 49:9	good-faith 33:17	41:8 93:2,9,17
friendly 58:25	76:1 85:2	51:19 52:22,23	goodness 59:17	guy 41:16 75:13
87:24 88:14	game 87:9	52:24 53:15	Google 17:19	75:14 82:18
friends 34:13	Gardner 77:7	61:25 72:13	27:2	guys 7:16 8:4
42:6 56:13	garner 94:9	73:22 77:1,22	gosh 22:9	37:17 41:23
81:8,8,9,9,9	Gary 53:24	78:2 79:20,25	government	
frivolous 39:14	gaslight 72:8	82:4,15 83:8	45:16	Н
		,		
	I	I	I	I

				Page 10
half 17:13 64:5	83:2,12,15	heal 20:23	49:20	honologenoge
66:14,15 70:20	84:8,10,16	health 8:5 20:16	Hi 4:7	hopelessness 31:25
90:22 93:4	85:16,21,25	22:14 32:5	hidden 35:18	hopes 88:24
Hall 28:23 36:17	86:3 94:16,25	50:20	58:9	hoping 25:5
Hampshire 1:1	95:3,7,11,13	healthy 52:5	hide 7:19 58:4,9	Hornick 54:18
1:5 2:14 4:9,10	95:18	hear 3:4 14:6	high 20:10,12	85:20,22
4:13 5:1 7:3	happen 22:8	34:17,24 35:22	46:10 56:8	horrible 32:22
8:5,7,17 16:10	36:6 55:10,18	45:2,4 79:13	high-conflict	horrific 17:11
16:12 19:25	64:15 74:19	83:2 92:2	23:4 39:19	33:11 35:13
20:2,4 21:13	78:22 92:23	heard 10:25	72:21 81:19	36:4
23:18 25:13	happened 22:7	15:4 19:15	86:25	hospital 38:13
26:1,3 27:1	27:20 30:14	34:7 54:24	higher 91:14	41:3 66:20
29:1,6 30:24	35:2,16 51:4	56:1 60:20,24	highly 32:13	
31:15,24 32:6	87:17 89:14	67:11 72:15	35:25 73:1	68:2,2,5 70:3 70:22
33:23 34:21	92:20 94:12	74:25 83:5,6	89:20,23	hospitalized
35:4 36:22	happening 34:8	84:20 86:8,25	hire 50:22 85:14	66:19 68:11
40:5 46:8 54:4	35:1 64:20	88:9 91:21	hiring 80:1	hotel 68:21 69:6
59:3 64:16	75:16 78:21	hearing 1:6 2:9	history 32:3,6	hour 64:5 68:12
66:9 67:2,4,11	87:1 89:22	3:1,10,24	50:20 88:17	78:11
67:12 68:1,4,5	happens 39:4	10:19,25 11:8	hit 50:24	hours 47:21 74:2
70:6 71:19	53:14 54:22	11:13 12:1	hitting 70:15	78:8,8
86:6 90:22	78:20 86:16	17:1 24:8	Hodge 4:6,7,8	house 7:6,14
Hampshire's 9:4	89:17 90:9,24	27:14 31:2	8:13 82:2	37:14 44:10,11
Hampton 62:2	92:13	44:9,15 71:6	hold 36:3 75:17	47:18 77:20
hand 8:9 45:17	happiness 46:7	79:13 81:3	82:15 91:14,18	household 48:1
82:15	happy 46:13	95:21	holding 2:9	65:5
handed 55:17	52:5	hearings 10:13	22:25 73:11	housing 56:10
61:19 69:20	harassed 43:4	39:13 77:19	home 6:15 14:16	huge 39:25
handful 17:6	harassing 41:16	heart 5:25 26:5	24:16,18 34:9	40:10 42:6,6
handle 8:19	83:4	42:3 75:15	38:6 39:1	58:21 79:1
10:17	harassment	heartache 79:7	40:17 41:17	human 18:17
handled 9:25	30:24 37:15	hearts 21:15	42:19,20 43:16	humanity 92:4
handling 29:3	38:24 39:17	73:25	49:18 56:9	hurt 72:2 74:6
57:19	40:20,21 41:17	Heidebrecht	63:21 66:17	76:18 77:8
handout 3:14	46:5 83:23	85:24 86:2,4,5	69:17 70:15	hysterical 91:22
hang 77:17	harassments	held 10:13 40:22	72:1	
Hanover 86:6	40:14	Heller 29:18	home-based	I
Hantz 2:2,5 4:2	hard 24:12	help 2:10 8:6	43:17	idea 42:11 43:18
8:12,14 15:10	80:21	21:12 35:11	Honor 23:16	57:9 62:12
15:16 16:4	harder 59:15	51:8 52:9,9,24	37:8 53:25	identify 27:17
23:11,14 29:13	hardship 39:25	52:25 53:8	honorable 31:11	IEP 67:20 68:3
29:15 31:6,9	harm 13:4 44:24	58:24 60:10	honoring 9:13	70:4
34:2 37:7	45:23 64:20,25	61:19 66:2	Honors 43:11	IFB 24:22 25:5
42:12,15,17	harmful 44:22	72:6,25 73:3,8	hop 26:22	25:12
43:8,10 46:15	Harmony 94:10	73:8 87:23	hope 3:4 15:9	ignored 33:1
46:17,21 53:18	HAVEN 9:3	helped 33:12	36:7 37:2,3	39:23 93:20
53:20,24 55:17	head 34:10 38:7	57:23	85:12 90:3	illegal 45:10
66:6 73:14	heading 22:19	helping 72:24	94:14	78:14
80:4 81:11,15	heads-up 41:6	helplessness	hopefully 80:9	illiterate 17:11
00.7 01.11,13	neaus-up TI.0	neipiessiiess	Hoperuny 00.7	
		l	I	l

				Page 11
illugion 45,15	80:7	40.2 50.17 21	intowy	
illusion 45:15		49:2 50:17,21	interviewers 33:19	<u>J</u>
imagery 5:15	improves 65:11 65:11	87:15,18 95:4		jail 18:10,16
imagine 33:20		informed 13:21	intimate 8:23 intimi 83:4	91:11
imbalance 46:3	inappropriate	inherently 58:25		January 1:7
immediate 48:1	49:6,12 63:16	initial 24:9 47:3	intimidating	9:14 58:7 67:9
56:15,18 64:25	incarcerated	86:20	83:5	67:9
immediately	51:20 53:1	initially 17:15	Introcaso 25:21	jarring 48:11
21:22 59:24	69:24	50:8 56:17	44:10	Jenesse 76:6
67:25 92:24	incident 41:5,6	initiated 68:7	invasion 24:15	jeopardized
immigration	92:25	injuries 34:9	invasive 48:13	40:22
11:15 67:9	include 2:11	injury 19:4	88:12	Jersey 16:9
imminent 41:9	13:6,11 56:8	innocent 28:19	investigating	job 9:1 26:13
64:25 65:2	86:13	43:16 45:5	92:15	33:5
immune 82:25	included 3:21	46:1	investigations	jobs 36:19
impact 16:1	8:19	input 2:23 95:22	40:13	joined 11:9
36:9 40:10	including 30:2	inquiry 30:2	invited 93:21	Joining 2:23
42:5,6	32:17 33:22	inside 32:17	invoke 46:25	joint 71:9
impacted 9:23	62:5 65:5	Instagram 6:20	involve 29:7	Jones 16:5,6
31:17	87:13	instance 12:2	involved 11:11	23:13
impacts 15:21	income 56:11	instances 54:24	28:24 32:4	judge 9:6 10:12
56:14	inconvenience	institution 38:22	56:15 64:5	13:6 19:18
imperative	47:17	instructions	65:12 72:6	23:5 24:3,21
55:16	increase 85:14	3:20	74:6	25:11 27:15
implementing	increasing 2:18	insurance 78:25	involving 29:1	28:23 32:19
89:19	28:10,11 85:8	79:6	ironic 94:8	33:1,8,10,20
implicit 22:19	increasingly	intentional 65:6	irrelevant 28:8	33:23 34:16,18
implies 81:19	63:10	interest 32:18	isolated 35:15	36:17 39:4
87:1	incredibly 48:13	interested 32:20	35:20	40:15 48:19
implore 53:10	49:12	35:11 78:1	issuance 14:12	51:15 54:6
importance	independent	interests 49:22	issue 9:21 10:12	56:23 57:1,11
55:12	24:4	interference	12:5,15 14:7	57:19 65:3
important 8:22	indicated 65:20	4:15 12:16	14:11 55:11	75:1,2,8,11
8:22 15:7 28:6	indiscernible	15:8 16:7 22:3	56:6 58:21	77:19,24 81:5
36:11 51:12,22	34:19 42:13	26:12 29:4	61:22 62:7,21	81:9 82:11
60:8 65:18	77:15 83:16	35:5 38:8	63:19 64:17	88:21 91:1
78:6 82:1	94:17	42:12 46:5	77:21	92:1 93:19
86:17 90:6,12	individual 52:10	57:7 58:17,23	issued 12:8	judge-to-judge
importantly	55:19,25 61:2	64:13,19	13:25 15:22	13:12
56:2,2	individuals	internet 26:25	18:3 24:2,10	judges 4:24,25
impossible 17:17	33:24 34:21	interpret 18:6	24:21 49:10	5:1,14,16
impoverished	54:11 59:13	interrogation	issues 9:7,11	10:16,16 14:19
79:9 83:24	63:5,7 92:22	78:3	11:16 14:16	21:6,8 22:10
impoverishing	inexpensive 33:7	interrupts 83:25	32:5 39:23	22:15,19,21,22
83:25	infliction 65:6	84:1	56:16 58:19	23:3 28:9
improperly	inform 9:18	intervention	62:3,5 63:12	33:16 35:24
14:24 15:1	information	12:12 88:20	item 26:22 27:6	36:9,15 39:13
improve 2:22	3:13,16 7:13	90:15,17 91:6	28:10,22 30:1	39:19 56:23
90:4	13:22 30:5,8	interventions	30:2	57:12 59:12
improvements	32:8 44:22	91:2	items 86:11	61:20 62:19

Page 12

				Page 12
72.0.74.20	1 240	14 10 15 20 21	1. 2.14.20.0.10	10 6 27 0
73:9 74:20	24:9	14:19 15:20,21	law 2:14,20 9:19	19:6 27:8
75:7 76:1,11	K	19:16 21:17	10:10 12:7	32:13 33:5,6
76:20 79:3 83:10 87:5	Kathleen 25:22	22:11,20 24:12	13:21 23:24	40:20 46:5
	Kathryn 16:5	25:13,20 27:4	27:4 29:1,5,11	54:5 58:20
90:10 91:17,18	Kathy 74:15,16	27:13,20,21 28:20 30:14,15	29:23 39:16 43:22 45:15	59:4,5 66:24 71:8
judgments 13:4 judicial 2:7,25	74:17	35:23 37:18,20	46:11 52:2	legally 19:20
3:2 12:12 26:3	keep 5:10,11 7:3	39:13,21 50:11	54:4,5 64:14	legislative 55:15
26:24 28:7,8	7:4 16:23	50:15,16 51:20	64:16 75:19	59:9 80:5
30:16 31:24	39:20 40:19	52:8,22 53:6	76:15,17,18	84:11
33:22 35:19	83:24	53:13 54:22	80:15 81:4	legislator 85:8
37:2 45:20	keeping 88:21	55:17 57:21	lawlessness	legislature 33:12
55:13,16 58:12	keeps 76:21	62:2,20 64:15	45:15	59:3 60:10
60:8 89:3 90:1	Kelly 9:6	65:18,20 66:3	laws 32:18 86:21	64:1 86:21
91:14,20	kept 6:17 21:25	74:1,4,7,18,18	lawyer 8:16	legislature's
judiciary 36:22	70:20	74:23 75:15,23	59:14 71:4	88:22
86:18 90:5	kid 7:7	77:15 79:9	lawyers 8:18,18	legitimate 26:14
juicy 84:5	kidnapped	80:23,23,25	58:21,24 59:18	legitimately 93:6
Julie 25:21	47:19	81:20 82:9	60:4 61:20	lengthy 32:5
44:10	kids 4:21 5:21	83:17 84:18,25	64:4 65:3	lens 74:10
July 16:8	15:19,21 16:2	85:4 86:8 87:2	72:25	let's 5:9 80:11
junior 46:10	16:3 25:4,5,25	87:7,23,23	lazy 22:2	84:4
jurisdiction 9:21	41:9,9,12 42:6	88:10,10,11,13	lead 64:3 88:24	letter 52:12
10:1 29:3	43:6 63:21	88:14 89:14	lead-up 88:13	68:25 69:8
64:13	73:24 74:6	90:2,7,7,10,12	leader 25:5 26:1	letters 70:5
jurisprudence	75:14 78:17	90:23,24 91:5	27:1	letting 61:22
28:16	81:7	91:11 92:5,7	leadership 24:7	62:1 66:4 91:9
justice 2:2,5,6	kill 47:22 74:24	92:13,21 93:23	leads 28:8	level 37:16
4:2 8:12,14	killed 35:14	94:3,14	lean 34:12	libel 45:18
15:10,13,16	kind 4:23 16:15	knowing 69:22	learned 17:1	liberties 45:1
16:4,21 18:12	19:21 25:6	knowledge 30:9	32:14 33:21	library 27:4
23:11,14 29:13	26:2,8 27:21	known 48:7	35:8 85:5,9	license 70:11
29:15 31:1,6,9	27:22 28:22,23	74:17 77:7	learning 35:11	licensing 84:19
31:10 34:2	29:5,24 30:1	knows 49:19	39:15	90:14
37:7 42:12,15	37:19 41:5	54:19 93:12	leave 4:16 7:20	lie 80:14,17,17
42:17 43:8,10	53:12 77:16	knucklehead	25:7 37:6	80:19
46:15,17,21	79:2,4 80:24	92:3	69:16 72:5	life 23:23 31:17
53:18,20,24	81:13 88:13	Korean 78:3	86:9	31:17 45:11
55:12,17,21	89:13	Krueger 58:4	leaving 86:7	52:7 79:15
66:6 73:14	kinds 12:6 14:17		Lebanon 54:4	life-or-death
79:12 80:4,12	38:14	L	led 14:2 40:10	36:21
81:11,15 83:2	knew 16:18 51:2	lack 17:16 40:2	48:25 49:2	lifelong 36:20
83:12,15 84:8	82:10	44:21	94:11	lifetime 32:7
84:10,16 85:16	know 5:1,1,2,3	ladies 66:10	left 22:25 31:24	light 29:4 42:23
85:20,21,25	5:23,25 6:4,9	large 13:18 55:3	34:4,6 79:18	likelihood 15:23
86:3 89:7	6:25 7:1,15,15	56:3	86:17,19	likes 77:25
94:16,25 95:3	7:16,20 8:4,4	largest 4:8 68:4	leg 21:20	limit 3:8
95:7,11,13,18	8:23 9:1,7,10	lastly 20:24 93:1	legal 2:19 16:14	limited 3:6
justification	10:9,11 14:10	late 51:7	17:14 18:21	15:18 39:17
	•	•	•	•

				Page 13
54 10 (1 11	20 17 67 22		12.22	1242
54:12 61:11	30:17 67:22	machine 69:11	43:23	medication 69:10
limiting 46:6	68:6 70:3 94:1	mad 79:18	mark 24:21	
83:4	located 24:4	madness 44:18	50:24	medicine 5:6,7 meet 56:22
limits 63:4	lodged 94:4	magistrate 54:6	marriage 24:11	
line 21:12 63:6	Logan 69:20	mail 3:11	38:4	meeting 3:4 9:15
72:22 76:22	long 21:25 48:2	maintain 56:9	mask 71:3	9:16 12:13
list 2:25 4:6	50:23 61:7	56:10	Massachusetts	58:7 67:22
28:22 47:2,3	69:19 92:2,6	maintained 71:7	20:4 24:5,22	69:1
listen 25:8 31:18	longer 4:14,16	majority 11:3	26:7 28:25	meetings 9:14
57:21 73:10	34:25	90:6	29:1 32:6 35:4	69:3
listened 9:14	look 2:23 22:9	making 2:15	66:23 67:1,4	meltdowns 70:2
listening 95:17	29:2 46:2	5:17 26:23	67:10 71:18	member 3:20
litem 15:5 18:1,5	61:23 77:10	30:10 55:19	76:15	58:1,16 62:25
18:7,9,15,21	82:15 86:19	63:25 78:23	massive 16:25	members 2:24
25:23 33:2	90:3	80:7	17:6	2:25 15:2
49:18 67:25	looked 52:10	male 90:11,13	Master 25:24	23:17 31:11
68:1 84:6,6,19	looking 26:8	malicious 30:5	43:23	37:8 43:11
84:21,23	47:22 82:14	managing 46:4	material 94:22	54:2,20 56:13
litems 73:9	looks 4:21 5:2,4	mandate 88:16	matter 34:7	56:22 57:5
84:13	50:20 78:2	mandated 47:25	52:18 53:1	65:5 66:9
literally 36:21	89:16 95:3	90:23	62:19 78:5	Memorial 51:4
litigant 57:22,22	loophole 93:18	mandatory 87:6	96:5	memories 42:4
92:6	loopholes 7:8	manic 38:18	mean 5:13 6:25	men 80:17 91:5
litigants 9:18	lose 8:1 60:2	manipulated 6:1	7:2,12 14:23	mental 8:5 20:16
55:25 59:1	63:21 73:6	33:24 44:19	26:17 27:12	22:14 32:5
62:19 65:12	78:17 88:19	manipulation	57:10 63:3,20	38:22 50:20
litigations 40:7	89:2	73:3 88:4	63:22,22 65:23	mentally 53:9
little 2:3 6:25	losing 76:7,8	March 96:15	78:20 79:3	mention 29:19
7:17 37:17,19	lost 26:2 41:9	Marconi 2:2,5	83:20 90:6	45:12 73:23
45:11 46:25	42:25 87:11	4:2 8:12,14	92:7,11	mentioned
80:13 81:12	94:10,11	15:10,16 16:4	means 6:22	12:16 13:6
84:13 85:12	lot 6:23 8:4 42:4	23:11,14 29:13	17:22 64:24	messages 72:5
93:19	42:22 44:24	29:15 31:1,6,9	66:2 93:7	74:14
live 19:5 34:18	45:2 48:21	31:10 34:2	meant 47:2 52:2	messed 93:19
52:4 56:9 57:7	59:17 61:8	37:7 42:12,15	52:3 64:24	met 33:15 42:22
60:2 86:6	62:4 64:14	42:17 43:8,10	measures 36:8	75:1
90:18	74:12 76:25	46:15,17,21	mechanism	Meyers 89:6
lived 66:15,22	89:17 94:14	53:18,20,24	44:25 63:15	Michigan 25:1
70:8	lots 5:15 74:10	55:17 66:6	mechanisms	29:2
lives 11:7 35:6	love 8:7,7 21:13	73:14 80:4	60:22 61:9,18	microphone
71:20 75:23	low 44:16	81:11,15 83:2	65:11 89:11	3:25
livestream 2:3	low 44:16	83:12,15 84:8	mediate 67:19	microscope
livestreamed 3:1	Lowell 38:12	84:10,16 85:16	mediation 48:14	21:23 73:6
living 37:11 48:1	lucky 73:21	85:21,25 86:3	49:6,16 87:6	middle 41:25
70:19	lunchtime 82:24	94:16,25 95:3	87:10,12	73:24
LLC 1:17	lying 17:25 22:2	95:7,11,13,18	medical 32:24	mimics 86:15
lobby 3:14,22	M	marital 24:16,18	33:18 39:15	mind 27:23 50:6
local 17:13	Ma'am 94:21	25:23 38:23	40:3,4 78:24	52:5 53:21
22:13 23:3	1114 WIII /T.21	40:15,18 41:3	medicate 69:10	minds 21:15
	l	l	l	

				Page 14
mine 34:22	72:12 78:9	91:15	23:23 34:7	notify 87:5
minor 24:6	79:14 83:11	names 58:17	38:19 41:20,21	notion 64:18
88:25 89:1	Moore 24:3,22	73:19	41:21 43:19	November 25:3
92:24	25:21	narcissistic 5:3	48:7,8 50:14	25:3 94:7,10
minority 45:7	morning 17:2	38:18	52:6 60:19	94:11
minutes 71:1	morons 25:25	narrative 44:20	69:18 71:18,19	number 3:17,17
84:24 85:1	mother 17:13,18	57:9	74:25 86:8	3:21 8:19 9:9
misdiagnosed	18:2,6,10,11	narrowed 14:23	88:17	9:25 20:8
20:17	18:13,16,19,24	15:3	new 1:1,5 2:14	53:16 58:20
misinterpreted	31:13 32:10	narrower 81:12	4:9,10,13,25	68:3 92:17,19
17:24	37:21,24 38:16	Nashua 23:18	6:23 7:3 8:5,7	95:5
missing 26:10	39:9 40:24	24:1 25:20	8:17 9:4 16:8,9	numerous 32:24
85:12	41:11 53:15	national-known	16:11 19:24	
mistake 25:10	69:19 70:16	20:3	20:2,3 21:13	0
mistakes 26:12	75:11,12 86:5	nationally 5:1	23:18 25:13	Oberman 89:9
39:5	mothers 16:22	nature 64:12	26:1,3 27:1	obligation 36:23
misunderstand	20:5,8 76:7	near-constant	29:1,6,20	observed 77:15
58:7	motion 91:15	34:4	30:23 31:14,23	obtain 14:15
model 35:7	motions 17:20	nearly 35:14	32:6 33:23	occasions 91:24
modern 89:4	18:9 39:14,18	71:17	34:21 35:4	occur 14:17
modifications	mount 44:18	necessary 51:14	36:22 40:5	occurrence
64:2	move 6:21,21,22	need 11:8 20:21	46:8 51:17	93:24
mom 5:22 6:2,6	12:3 67:10	21:12 26:11	54:4 59:3	occurring 32:23
17:11 24:10	83:13 89:24	28:3 29:2	64:16 66:9	ODD 20:10
73:21	93:19	35:23 37:5	67:2,4,10,12	Odom 96:2,7,15
moment 88:6	moved 66:16	41:3,4 43:24	68:1,3,5 70:6	odyssey 16:19
Monday 3:18	67:2	52:20,20,23	71:19 74:9	offender 32:7
money 16:3	moves 93:6	55:13,19 56:5	86:6,21 90:22	89:13
18:13,13 21:10	moving 89:25	56:14 57:16	NHCADSV 82:8	offensive 13:6,7
46:5 50:17	multi-day 63:11	60:3,11 61:4	82:19,25	13:9
62:23 65:16	multi-state	61:15,19,23	night 17:1 41:16	offer 59:18
70:17 76:25	28:25	66:2 74:22	41:25 72:23	offered 82:13
77:4 78:12	multiple 51:9	75:24 76:19	nights 72:23	offering 8:3
79:1,11	76:4 90:19	78:4,5 89:23	nine-month	90:22
money- 78:22	Munchausen	needed 2:13	11:23	office 3:12 8:9
money-grubbi	70:23	16:12 35:1	nobody's 26:17	30:17 50:19
22:3	murder 28:18	43:4 84:24	noise 42:1	95:8
money-making	mutual 14:12	90:2 91:8	nonspecific	official 96:4
78:23	mutually 10:20	needs 7:7 16:3	20:19	officials 49:11
Monica 89:9		20:9 49:21	Nope 82:16	74:21 89:3
Monigle 66:8,9	N	79:12 80:12	normal 41:20	91:14
monster 52:15	N 1:17	85:5 88:5	86:15	oftentimes 7:19
month 3:16 20:1	naïve 32:3	negative 17:22	North 78:2	54:16,17 56:5
94:8	name 8:15 23:17	17:23 47:7	notes 17:3 68:4	59:16,25 60:1
months 10:24	27:17 31:12	negatives 92:18	70:3	60:13 63:10
11:12 24:8	45:2 48:7	neglect 54:13	notice 63:7	64:4 65:23
41:14,18,19	74:23 86:5	negotiated 60:13	notices 93:21	oh 4:2 75:10
44:6 47:19	name's 4:7	neither 35:20	notification	78:3 80:17
67:16 71:14,20	name-calling	never 11:24,24	93:15	85:7 94:22

				Page 13
okay 2:2 42:14	12:16 14:1,14	oversight 36:8	30:15 34:16	paying 79:25
56:22 57:25	15:12 16:13	36:13,24	39:17 51:13	84:22 85:3
58:3,12 62:22	19:4 20:21,22	overwhelmed	63:11 70:24	peace 20:22
75:15 80:18	24:5,9 25:11	45:14	76:1 78:19	peaceful 23:25
82:14,16 83:14	25:21 28:1	overworked	83:23 91:7	peacefully 25:15
84:6 85:25	38:24 39:7	28:8	parte 24:10 41:7	pediatric 5:7
86:3 95:6,21	40:15,18,19	owned 43:16	56:17 57:24	pediatrician's
old 38:10 47:10	47:15 48:3	owner 37:21	67:24	50:19
48:6 61:15	50:25 51:3	39:9	participant 3:6	peers 36:17
66:15 67:3	56:25 67:4,10	owning 47:17	participate	penalized 33:10
72:3,15	67:24 68:19	oxygen 37:25	68:25	penalizes 88:7
older 66:18	69:12 71:7,8		particular 20:13	penalties 30:11
68:10 69:10,10	71:17,18,19	P	75:8 78:13	30:13
69:25 70:21	76:12 77:15,25	p.m 2:1 95:24	particularly	penalty 79:23
oldest 31:17	79:3,4 88:21	packet 52:12	17:10 29:4,17	80:2
once 22:1 43:18	93:14 94:4	page 70:21,21	91:16	pending 29:20
65:24 68:16	ordered 33:3	pages 75:6	particulars	pending 25:20 people 3:5,24
74:13 76:9	39:22 67:25	paid 18:12	23:21	5:8,11,13,17
one's 56:8,9,10	68:14 73:5	pain 34:8 70:24	parties 9:13	6:4,5,23 7:15
62:25,25 63:14	77:18 79:3	paint 74:20	10:19,20 27:13	7:24 9:22 17:4
63:21,21	88:17,18 90:16	pandemic 71:25	45:13,24 52:13	24:12 35:22
one-week 69:17	ordering 75:2	72:17	60:13 88:24	36:6 41:1
one-woman	91:7	paper 47:16	partner 8:23	42:22 45:7,23
21:11	orders 2:16 10:2	95:1	35:3 56:6	46:6 52:8,17
ones 21:4 61:4	10:18,23 11:1	paperwork 49:4	62:23 92:14	54:25 55:1,2,3
85:2	12:8 13:15,25	49:7 51:23	parts 27:9	55:4,6 56:5
ongoing 12:24	14:4,12,21,25	52:18 53:2,3	party 24:24	57:16 58:21
32:23 37:4	15:1,22 18:3,6	parent 31:23	25:18 28:3	59:6 60:11,19
onset 93:2	19:22 26:9,14	33:5 52:15,16	62:24	61:5,10,11,19
onus 53:7	26:16 36:17	56:8 70:23	pass 33:12	61:22 62:1
open 10:12	39:7 51:1,8	74:8 78:4,10	passed 90:22	65:15,20 66:1
operate 59:10	52:22 56:18	84:21 85:3	passion 35:9	66:3 74:13
operates 45:8	60:16	86:8 87:24	46:25	75:4,15,17
opportunities	organization	89:2	passionate 35:9	76:24 77:10
52:9	94:1	parental 49:14	passive-aggres	78:2 79:4,9,10
opportunity 3:8	organizations	61:1 65:8	69:2	79:10 80:21,22
16:7 17:9 44:7	34:23	parenting 14:16	passports 69:21	80:22 81:20
46:23 49:5,13	original 10:25	32:19 36:1	passwords 24:12	82:22 83:10,20
50:10 66:11	originally 93:17	48:9 51:22	pasting 17:20	83:24 85:13
opposed 17:23	other's 24:10,12	52:12 65:4	patient 85:6	86:7 87:1 91:7
opposing 70:21	outside 33:21	73:2	patients 4:9,14	91:10 92:6
opposition 44:18	51:11 71:13	parents 16:2	6:11	94:18
option 49:5	outstrip 79:6	32:16 33:14,15	patients' 7:19	people's 7:18
51:24	overlook 19:18	37:24 41:18,25	pattern 12:24	73:18
options 80:25	overlooked	52:13 68:14	Paul 24:3,22	percent 18:4
order 3:25 6:18	71:22	78:14 88:23	25:21	20:5,8,15,24
8:19 9:25 10:6	overnight 68:20	part 9:23 13:16	pay 18:11 78:10	21:1 26:14,15
10:8,14,21	69:9	14:7,11 15:25	78:14 79:1,19	77:4 85:5
11:3,12,17	overrun 45:21	21:18 22:15	79:21 95:9	90:13,13
	J. V. L. W. L. 10121		,,,==,,,,	, , , , , , ,
	l	l	l	I

				Page 10
perception	12:10	pocket 79:1	65:14 91:15	55:10
58:11	petitioners	point 18:1 22:18	practiced 57:6	principles 15:13
perfect 26:17	14:14	26:10 28:7	practices 2:11	prior 23:24
perfectly 13:18	petitions 13:23	29:16 38:21	4:9 77:22	prison 75:13
period 9:22	13:24 14:1	39:24 41:1	practitioners	privacy 24:15
11:18 28:19	27:16 54:11,12	47:13 54:15,23	15:5	private 14:18
61:9	58:4 60:23	60:7 71:4 89:3	precedent 44:25	54:9 65:14
perjury 93:7	63:1	91:9	precious 43:3	pro 14:21 27:7
permanent 10:6	pew 25:4 28:2	pointed 38:7	predator 18:22	58:25 79:10
13:25 16:9,19	Phoenix 1:18	pointing 31:2	19:1,2,4 20:21	80:21 92:6
permanently	phone 67:17	76:5	34:11 47:8	probably 38:1
18:25	68:5 72:4,24	points 47:2	predetermined	38:10 75:18
permission 6:13	phones 7:19	74:11 86:10	44:20	76:3
permitted 63:7	phonetic 10:2	police 6:12	predominantly	problem 8:24
perpetrating	42:7 74:15	22:14,23 30:17	5:24 87:3	73:20
91:17	89:7,8,10	38:4,5,20	90:10 91:5	problematic
perpetrator	physical 16:14	40:24,25 41:6	preference	62:18
16:16	18:21 19:6	41:15 44:8,14	88:22	procedure 2:12
perpetrators	32:24,25 56:5	72:23 76:11	pregnancy	procedures
17:8	66:24 71:8	88:8 92:24	18:20	80:23,24 84:5
perpetual 31:25	physically 65:21	93:16	pregnant 32:9	proceed 3:23
perpetual 31.23 person 8:9 23:25	pick-up 4:4	policy 9:8 55:19	47:11,20	proceeded 72:7
32:4 49:19	pick-up 4:4 pictures 6:20	politicians 73:17	preliminaries	proceedings
55:7 57:23	piece 47:16 95:1	poor 60:25	3:23	1:20 2:1 13:16
60:25 63:15	piece 47:16 93:1	-		14:22 27:13
	-	population 7:9 90:13	prepare 17:2 57:23 72:25	
74:18 77:13	pilot 19:16			63:11 95:24 96:4
79:24 81:24	Pistol 29:20	portion 50:25	prepared 15:17	
82:1,8,10,11	place 4:19 9:3 11:4 36:2 60:2	Portsmouth 8:16	31:7 59:2,3 63:8	process 9:13,24
82:20 87:3				10:8,9 11:20
91:25 92:15	placing 46:5	position 25:12	prescribed	21:1 33:15
personal 18:13	plaintiff 27:11	36:20	69:11	36:12 45:9
19:24 79:4	27:19 30:4	positions 36:23	present 12:9	50:18 51:19
84:2	plaintiffs 8:20	90:5	24:17 44:7,8	52:25 55:23
personality 5:3	10:22,23 11:2	possible 4:12	62:16 81:24	proclaimed 94:7
20:19,20 38:18	11:9 14:9,13	post 3:12 95:8	82:5 92:25	produced 1:20
personally 57:14	15:9 27:16	post- 86:13	presented 70:6	profession 72:19
93:21	28:12 56:4,12	post-separation	80:15	professional
personnel 75:25	56:24 57:3	86:14,23 92:14	presents 72:9	33:3 37:5
76:19 85:14	58:13 60:5	potential 64:1	preside 35:25	70:11 96:5
perspective	plans 65:4	potentially 23:2	presumption	professionals
28:15 48:25	plea 47:24 91:7	23:3 56:6	45:17	32:13,24 61:20
perspectives	pleading 93:13	power 31:19	pretty 26:25	89:4,20 90:1
31:2	pleadings 40:7	34:15 36:20	29:24	profoundly
petition 10:14	pleads 27:20	46:3 63:15	prevent 64:20	31:17 33:25
10:25 12:23	please 43:12	powerful 36:23	64:24	progeny 29:19
30:10 48:10	49:11 73:8,8	practical 62:18	previously 48:5	program 7:2
52:12 56:16,16	73:10	practice 30:14	primarily 16:22	21:9,18 59:20
petitioner 13:1,7	plenty 53:5	54:4,9 57:11	20:3	59:21,21 90:17
petitioner's	Plymouth 57:21	63:11 64:15	primary 7:22,23	90:19,22 91:12

				Page 17
programs 17.16	6:8 9:6	nut 3.7 7.7	26:6,13 36:2,8	record 23:17
programs 17:16 90:15 91:3	proven 71:10	put 3:7 7:7 21:15,23 29:24	45:3,8 64:25	41:21 95:16
	proven 71.10 provide 9:12	35:1 38:22	82:6 91:24	recorded 1:20
progresses 4:5 prohibits 24:23	36:8 61:23	39:5 40:14,23	reality 4:20 6:10	
•	69:9 71:23	47:20 48:8	realize 89:17	recording 1:20 3:2,2 40:16
project 19:16 21:25	provided 9:3	47:20 48:8 80:2 93:13	realized 47:11	3:2,2 40:16 96:4
promise 85:7	21:19 68:1	putting 4:21,23		
-	82:8	6:20	really 4:21 5:10 5:16,17 17:23	records 39:3 68:3 90:20
proof 13:2 64:23 proofreader		0:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
96:2,16	provider 4:18 7:22	Q	21:14 51:21,25 54:25 55:1	recover 20:23 reduce 76:10
· ·		qualified 21:2		
proper 80:23	provides 12:21 13:22 33:13	question 10:13	56:8 57:9 61:7	reduced 58:18
property 43:21		30:12 63:4	62:12 65:23	reducing 76:14
43:23 45:18	59:5	94:21	75:5,6,24	referenced 10:5
proposal 58:15	providing 30:5 58:20 66:3	questioning	76:18,19,19	reflects 52:18
proposals 56:21		56:24 57:2	77:2 80:21	reform 75:21
62:17	provision 33:13	questions 31:4	84:4 86:15,17	refuse 49:5 72:4
pros 59:7	proximity 12:22	46:13 57:24	90:12 92:19	refused 18:7
Prosecute 92:22	proxy 70:23	60:4 93:25	93:11,24 94:3	68:20,24
prosecuted 30:4	psychiatric 4:8	quick 41:5	94:13 95:9	regard 23:21
prosecutor	6:17 7:22,23	quickly 9:15	reason 5:12	26:22 27:6
87:19	68:4 70:3	32:11,12 47:11	18:22 43:21	28:10 30:1
prosecutorial	psychological	quietly 25:4,15	44:12	regarding 2:14
87:15	56:7	Quincy 76:16	reasonably	63:8 69:7
protect 13:17	psychologists	quite 37:13 56:4	12:25	regardless 12:22
16:1 25:12	61:21	87:25	reasons 64:21,22	registered 32:7
30:22 33:9	psychology 5:6	quote 30:8 76:2	reassured 82:21	regression 70:1
34:4,5,11 42:1	PTSD 5:2 7:25	78:13 88:21	rebuilding 35:6	regular 57:11
43:5 45:20	37:19 41:25 82:3	quoted 74:16	recall 44:16	79:4
52:3,3 72:13		quoteu / 7.10 	recap 41:14	regulations
86:22 87:13	public 1:6 2:9,17	R	receive 3:19	90:23
protected 11:4	3:1 6:24,24 7:13 9:8 11:5	racing 42:3	21:9 34:21 68:24	reinforced 76:5
protecting 32:20 protection 11:8		raised 10:12		reinforcing 80:9
16:19,24 19:19	25:5,16 26:24	rant 72:7	received 49:4	related 2:15,17
,	30:20 35:17	raping 19:7	71:23 93:15	19:20 relations 45:24
22:14,24 28:14	36:16 43:12	rapist 19:6	receiving 48:11	
30:24,25 43:2 50:2 52:21	46:18 54:2,7 54:18 56:3	rare 95:10	recognize 76:20 recommend	relationship 4:17 12:3 40:9
50:2 52:21 protective 2:16	54:18 56:3 58:1 91:10	rave 72:7		4:17 12:3 40:9
*		reach 3:20 60:13	10:18 36:7,12 86:9	
10:2,14 12:8 12:15 13:15	publicly 21:21 published 27:1	reaction 47:3	recommendati	78:4,6 86:20 relationships
14:4,14 16:22	•	read 24:10 26:1	91:4	2:20 16:1
31:23 32:17	punished 88:11 92:11	30:7 51:8	recommendati	Relative 84:4,5
33:14,15 36:17	punitive 51:14	74:14 75:6	23:6 33:2	relatives 56:13
48:3 51:1	punitive 31:14 purely 63:9	95:16	56:18 60:9,10	relaxed 64:21,22
66:22 75:12	purposes 87:21	reader 75:5	64:1 80:7 83:3	released 41:3
93:14 94:4	purposes 87:21 pursuant 24:16	reading 18:3	91:19	relevant 2:22
93:14 94:4 protocol 9:2	pursuit 46:7	47:1	recommended	12:14,20 29:17
90:14 92:23	pursuit 40:7 push 45:9 87:10	ready 2:2	18:21 66:21	29:24
protocols 4:19	pushed 68:8	real 6:24 8:24	69:15	relief 9:12 11:12
protocois 4.19	pusited 00.0	15:8 24:17	U9.1J	1 CHC1 7.14 11.14

-				Page 18
12:13 13:24,25	representing	43:16 45:6	right 5:22 7:2	run 28:13 55:8
rely 51:2	10:22 11:2	respondents	8:5,10 10:19	56:2 58:10
relying 91:3	17:12,18 54:10	45:5	16:18 26:16	68:11
remain 55:16	54:10,11 61:12	responsible	28:6,20 30:15	running 65:15
remained 34:22	65:14 85:3	49:15,16 92:15	30:23 37:1	84:2
remains 11:3	90:12	rest 83:2	42:17,19 50:16	04.2
remarks 3:6	request 13:25	restraining 6:18	51:11,22 56:8	S
15:6	21:3 30:16	8:19 9:25 10:6	56:9,10,11	S 24:3,21
remedial 64:12	50:16 67:10	10:8 16:13	57:13,15 58:2	sadly 13:8 14:2
remember 38:1	68:22	38:23 40:15,18	59:24 63:4	83:18,18
73:18	requested 48:14	40:19 47:15	66:8 73:9	safe 5:10,11 6:18
remembered	48:14 87:19	50:25 51:3	77:20 79:23	9:3 16:23 34:5
10:4	requesting	52:22 76:12	80:8 81:2,3,5,6	49:21 50:3,3
remind 55:13	67:24 93:15	restrictions 66:3	81:15,23,24	safeguards
remote 39:15	requests 87:13	result 11:15,16	84:8,16 85:18	33:13
remove 87:24	require 63:12	results 59:16	90:18	safely 89:24
92:17	87:5 92:24	retaliation 33:16	rights 8:1 29:8	safety 12:10
removed 93:2	required 22:15	return 41:19,22	32:20 33:6	13:1 16:10
renew 50:25	24:3 27:17	69:25 93:14	40:12 43:1	20:21 33:6
renewal 50:24	43:22 62:15	94:4	45:1,4,20	36:9,21 40:22
renewed 52:23	requirement	returned 34:9	46:11 49:14	42:25 43:5
renewing 23:2	13:2 22:11	41:13 69:5	61:1 65:8	46:6 48:9
rep 74:13	requires 46:1	93:9	87:10	51:12 52:21
repeated 83:5	59:9 62:9	reunification	rippled 39:25	86:22 89:4
repeatedly 17:24	requiring 24:21	69:15 74:25	risk 9:12 55:8	saint 87:2
21:3 34:24	research 64:17	77:6,11,12,18	56:2 69:23	Salem 4:9
83:25	72:19 87:16	77:25 78:23	room 37:18 42:2	Sanders 89:8,10
report 33:14,22	89:4	84:25	48:15 51:18	Santa 89:9
37:2 38:5,15	residence 7:4	reunify 67:21	roommates 63:1	Sarah 86:5
38:20 40:24,25	66:21	reversal 28:16	rooms 72:23	sat 44:6 51:16
41:7,15 44:15	resident 23:18	reverse 89:12	rooted 74:22	Satanic 6:20
68:10 70:5,14	24:24,25 67:6	reversed 48:24	Rosenfeld 89:9	saw 30:7 44:15
91:17 92:22,24	resides 28:3	revictimized	roughly 90:13	67:15 84:24
reported 68:13	resolutions 60:9	20:25	round 72:13	saying 41:3 58:6
69:13 94:11	60:14	revictimizing	routinely 19:9	62:11 63:16
reporting 32:21	resolve 88:25	35:12	20:1	65:9 90:8
33:10 77:8	resolving 63:12	review 2:10,11	RSA 12:20	says 27:18 28:11
reports 44:8	resource 23:2	9:10 23:4,5	27:17 30:15	52:12 53:3
68:2 70:4,4,22	37:4	29:10 91:20	33:13 38:24	77:17 80:2,17
represent 18:14	resources 2:12	reviewed 94:15	39:1 43:1	81:2,23 84:18
59:13 65:23	28:7,8 40:8	revised 9:6	62:15 83:8	scared 11:14
representation	respect 17:4	reward 45:12	RSAs 83:7	scary 4:17
60:5	62:3,8,21	74:7	RT 85:1	schedule 79:13
representative	63:19 64:10	Rhonda 4:6,8	rug 35:17	scheduled 69:3
9:3	respected 68:5	82:2	rule 83:8	79:14
Representatives	respectfully 86:9	rich 79:10	rules 64:22	scheduling
37:15	95:15	Richard 77:7	73:17 81:4	39:18
represented	respond 15:14	rid 84:17	92:7,9,11	scheme 46:1
55:2 91:23	respondent	Rifle 29:20	ruling 36:15	78:23

				Page 19
ash a sl 7.9 67.21	aanda 75.6	05.11	aiman life 27.12	11.24 10.0
school 7:8 67:21	sends 75:6	85:11	simplify 27:13 58:24	11:24 18:8
67:23 68:3,3,9	sense 4:20 6:9	sex 77:8		40:21 50:12,15
68:11 70:4	47:18 92:12	sexual 32:7	simply 12:19	53:14 76:12
71:14	sent 14:20 66:21	34:11	13:21 35:24	79:8 81:7
scientific 62:3	81:7,19 82:19	sexually 65:21	76:14	82:19,20,25
scope 15:3 84:13	93:21	shaking 11:14 share 16:7 17:5	single 21:6 22:5	somebody's 7:10
scorned 45:10	sentenced 50:4		25:17 32:10	someone's 46:7
scot-free 82:18	sentences 49:8	sharing 53:20	sinner 87:2	somewhat 54:12
screaming 70:24	74:11 80:10	she'd 74:24 82:6	sister 53:15	86:15,24 94:8
screwed 75:24	sentencing 9:20	sheets 3:9 4:3,4	sister-in-law	son 34:19 66:18
scrutiny 29:10	47:25 48:16,19	94:19	42:8	69:25 74:1
se 14:21 27:7	sentiments	shelf 37:3	sister-in-law's	son's 70:22
29:6 58:25	43:15	shelter 9:4	42:9	sons 67:3
79:10 80:21	separate 59:23	shined 35:19	sit 36:18 48:14	soon 21:21
92:6	59:23 77:21	shingle 77:17	51:18 74:2	66:18,23
second 11:25	separated 19:1	shocked 81:16	78:7	sorry 4:2 37:13
24:20 29:8,16	66:13,18	shoes 32:16	sits 37:3	52:24 57:13
43:1 52:7	separating 66:3	50:15	sitting 25:4,15	67:7 71:2
62:15 66:19	separation 12:3	shooting 26:7	28:1 35:24	77:22 94:22
secret 22:1	18:24 56:5	short 26:18	37:1	sort 6:24 26:4,5
secure 82:11	66:16 67:18	41:10 59:11	situation 6:10	30:19 54:21
security 4:3 43:1	86:14	shoulder 18:8	10:7 47:9 48:7	sorts 13:7 59:5
45:2 56:7	serious 33:17	show 41:2	48:12 49:11	64:8 65:17
see 10:2 22:6	seriously 52:23	showed 24:15	60:24 63:14	66:4
23:1 24:5 25:3	sermon 25:9	showing 12:8	86:9	sought 61:1
25:5 36:16	serve 61:19	69:3 70:1 88:5	situations 4:15	soul 5:25
45:15 50:14	served 44:5	shown 88:5	4:22 5:24 6:11	sound 1:20 96:4
51:19 52:11	54:18 67:5	shows 73:1	51:23 55:5	source 70:7,10
59:17 67:19	service 1:20 6:6	shutdowns 70:2	six 11:22 24:8	70:14
68:19 69:22	25:3,5,16	shutting 45:1	47:23 67:3,14	southern 17:12
71:21 73:25	services 17:14	sibling 62:25	67:15	space 27:10
74:1,7 77:1,1	17:15 21:19	sick 88:9	six- 86:5	speak 3:8,25
77:11 78:3	22:13 57:17	side 15:22 44:20	six-month 24:2	6:13 23:20
80:1,12 84:4	58:17,20 59:5	44:23 57:23	61:8	26:19 32:1
seeing 5:20,21	59:19 61:23	58:9,9 59:15	six-year 16:19	34:17 37:13
7:22 23:7 34:9	66:22	65:19	Sixth 28:14	43:12 46:23
88:12	session 59:9	sides 25:6 61:12	skills 35:11 96:5	50:10 60:21
seek 60:8 88:20	set 14:5 45:20	64:6 65:15	slander 45:18	66:11 72:4
seen 6:5 15:3	55:17 63:4	sign 85:24	slap 76:18	75:17 77:24
19:24 21:3,7	settled 22:4	sign-up 4:2,4	slightly 43:14	78:7 85:17
36:6 40:15	seven 21:7 23:21	94:19	slut 22:3	speaker 4:1
70:8 86:16	26:20 37:22	signed 3:25	small 7:9 21:14	73:17,18 86:1
seminar 76:6	39:12 40:20	85:18	43:16	speakerphone
Senate 37:16,16	70:8	significant 20:16	Smith 43:10,11	72:6
send 3:11 72:4,9	seven-days-a	21:14 56:4	46:16,19	speakers 85:22
74:9,14 75:3	21:11	silent 34:25	society 59:2,10	speaking 7:14
78:1 79:21	severe 32:5	similar 33:16	sole 66:24 71:8	7:23 17:19
94:23	34:11	34:22	solely 25:17	46:18 49:18
sending 82:25	severely 85:10	simple 76:17	somebody 7:6,7	80:10
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				Page 20
	.4.4. 2 10 4 12	l.,,	115146	40.22.57.4
special 20:9	state 2:19 4:13	stereotyping	11:5 14:6	49:23 57:4
special-needs	6:3 7:3,14 8:7	55:8	29:10 30:10	66:2 72:19
20:12	8:10 9:18	Sternenberg	90:8 94:23	79:16,20,25
specific 3:7	10:10 16:9,17	25:22	subjected 11:21	81:24 82:8
64:13 86:16	17:13 28:2	stop 20:22 33:9	60:1	83:9,22 85:8
89:20	31:16 32:18	39:17 42:5	subjective 13:4	88:22
specifically	34:6 35:21	43:7 49:17	subjects 2:10	supported 6:18
12:21 92:5	36:22 40:5	67:24 71:4	23:21 26:20	6:21 57:8
specifics 27:24	46:8 57:6 59:3	74:11 77:6	74:12	supporter 72:22
specifying 27:9	67:2 78:21	78:22 80:10	submit 23:12	77:13
spectrum 3:5	state's 90:23	87:23 91:16	41:1 53:21	supporting
spend 16:2	91:4	92:14	62:4 63:13	84:21
50:17 62:23	stated 15:6 30:7	stops 83:18,22	64:10 81:2,4	suppose 27:3
68:15 72:1,22	48:16 69:14	stories 34:24	submitted 18:9	supposed 6:15
split 73:24	70:6	story 34:24	submitting	28:3 40:1 50:2
spoke 48:17,17	statement 4:13	44:19,24	17:21 23:9	50:3 71:23
49:10 58:7	30:10 31:7	Stowers 46:21	succeeded 16:20	76:13 79:24
60:21	94:19	46:22 53:19,23	success 76:14	84:6
spoken 70:7	statements	straight 44:14	successfully 90:3	Supreme 1:1 2:6
spokespeople	46:24	strange 93:23 streamline 89:21	sudden 89:16	4:24 10:8,10
84:7	states 5:11 51:10		suffer 19:3 46:2	23:20 25:13
sponsored 89:7	67:8 69:16	Street 1:17	suffers 32:5	29:21 39:11,24
spot 47:22	72:20 89:21	streets 57:20	suffice 26:2	48:23
spotlight 35:19	90:2	strength 35:5	sufficient 56:24	sure 15:16 27:12
spouses 73:12	stating 44:16	stress 45:9 60:7	56:25	39:13 50:14
stable 56:9 staff 43:12 80:22	station 6:12 stations 72:24	stressed 45:9 strict 29:10	Suffolk 66:25 71:7	53:6 57:15,16 64:16 77:11
				86:2 88:1
stakes 56:4,7 stalk 7:10,11	statistics 26:9,11 80:18	strictly 84:12 stripped 34:3	suggested 56:23 57:4,5 58:3	92:17
stalk 7.10,11 stalking 2:16	status 2:14	stripped 34.3 strong 32:17	suggestion 15:2	surprising 35:20
13:15 54:12	status 2.14 statute 12:7	34:16 77:13	62:11	surprising 33.20 survivor 31:13
56:16 64:11	13:14,15 27:12	82:4	suicidal 20:6	31:13 47:6
stamp 95:8	63:1,6,13 64:2	stronger 62:6	38:14	53:8 72:21
stand 34:15 36:5	64:19 87:8,25	strongly 10:17	Suite 1:17	81:24 88:7,11
53:11 70:20,25	88:1,7 93:1,8	structured 45:9	suits 65:5	survivors 20:18
71:3	93:10	struggle 58:22	sum 65:9	21:8,10 31:14
standard 3:17	statutes 14:14	struggled 34:22	summons 79:20	35:10 72:24
12:12 13:3,9	14:23 15:3	58:19	Sunday 25:3	73:4 86:7 87:5
13:11 26:17	27:9 64:11,19	struggling 55:6	Sununu 94:7	87:9,13 88:1
30:21 44:16	64:24	stuck 7:18	super 4:17 80:9	91:15
56:20,22 91:14	statutory 44:13	studies 62:3	Superior 2:11	survivors' 87:10
standards 44:21	stay 68:20 69:8	study 20:11	10:1,6 60:23	suspend 85:19
standing 51:11	stayed 70:24	37:14,15 89:6	supervised 6:7	suspended 48:20
start 8:21	82:24	89:7,8,9	24:6 68:7	48:20,22
started 22:22,23	staying 68:21	stuff 30:20 37:9	support 2:13 6:2	sustainable
25:20 28:24	step 49:17 50:18	43:25 45:23	9:17 23:3	21:12
42:3 75:7 94:9	steps 2:21	92:2	32:12 34:12	swear 30:8,8
starting 3:15	stereotypes	stunning 46:9	35:5 39:11,16	swept 35:17
23:24 24:2	91:17	subject 2:22	40:2,3,4 42:8	system 2:8 13:17
			, ,	
		ı	ı	1

				Page 21
13:22 15:19	94:11	37:5,8 42:7	65:17 66:4	11:13,25 12:1
16:2 17:19	tax 50:17	43:8,9 46:15	74:19,25 75:16	12:23 14:8
19:10,10,13,16	taxpayer 45:12	46:16,20,22	76:9 77:23	15:18 16:3,11
26:3 30:22	team 67:20	53:18,19,20,22	79:17 83:13	18:10,16 21:6
31:16,20,24	technically 51:7	53:23 54:1	84:12	21:24 22:18
33:25 35:12,19	Telephone 95:4	66:4,6,11	think 5:12 10:12	23:9 29:13,14
35:21,22 36:2	tell 19:9 20:16	73:13,14,16	11:19 12:11	31:3,21 32:14
36:5 37:22	20:24 22:5	85:6,15,16	14:17,25 15:18	34:2 38:4,10
39:12,14 40:21	47:1 53:16	86:4 94:15,16	15:25 26:11	38:22,23 39:2
45:20 58:10,25	56:14 57:10	95:12,12,17,18	27:12,23 29:2	40:16,18,23
59:4,12 63:18	60:17 75:10	95:22,23	29:10,17,23	41:10,15 43:3
65:11,22 75:17	telling 44:20	thanking 8:21	30:21 50:12	43:18 44:1
80:6 89:22	54:15,23 72:5	71:24	54:18,24 55:25	48:2,3,20,22
93:6	79:12	theme 55:18	57:15 59:7	49:20 50:23
systemic 13:20	temporary	then-infant	60:20 61:3	53:1 58:22
systems 16:24	10:18,21,23	16:11	62:11 64:2	61:7 66:16
60:9	11:1,12 13:24	therapeutic	65:3,10,10,13	67:3,13,16,18
	13:24 14:21	88:20	66:1 71:6	71:1,21 72:1
T	15:22 56:25	therapeutically	83:17 85:4,4	73:13 88:19
T 92:9	60:15	88:25	86:17,25 88:7	89:2 90:23
t-shirt 21:24,25	term 86:25	therapist 67:20	89:21 90:5	91:11 93:8
22:6	terminated	67:23 68:6,25	92:5 94:11,22	timely 79:12
tactic 89:13	90:19	69:14 70:5	95:14,21	80:12
take 8:9 31:4	termination	77:16,16,18	thinking 59:10	times 14:11,14
34:2 41:8,15	49:14 61:1	90:21	76:9	14:20 24:5
41:18 52:23	65:7	therapists 70:3	third 62:7	36:17 39:11,24
63:8 65:16	terms 78:16	90:16	thought 47:11	51:9 53:16
taken 6:11 25:6	terrified 42:1	therapy 68:15	76:9 82:14	61:8 67:15
43:2,2 75:12	test 38:13 64:10	68:24 69:4,7	83:7,9	80:14,18
tale 91:23	testified 15:15	71:13,16 74:25	threat 12:9	tirelessly 50:14
talk 63:2 78:15	82:2,18	77:6,11,12,12	62:16 76:21	title 76:16
talked 7:21	testify 11:14	77:13,25 78:23	threatened 6:6	today 2:9 8:11
60:12 62:2	17:5 60:3	79:4 84:25	33:24 88:19	8:16 10:3 16:7
65:4,7	82:19 94:19	88:18	threatening	31:12 32:1
talking 54:19	testifying 11:5	they'd 74:2	18:10 73:3	34:15 35:14
59:11 71:5	11:20 81:25	thing 4:17 8:10	93:11	36:5,7 41:23
74:11 76:7	testimony 14:7	18:25 21:13	threats 38:25	42:2,7 46:23
80:16 92:1	23:10 25:25	22:9 28:24	three 11:22 19:7	47:2,5 54:21
targeted 17:7	37:6 44:8	36:11 41:11,12	24:5,6 39:13	54:25 60:12
task 1:5 2:7,9,24	60:20 64:6	42:23 50:4	41:14,18 68:21	66:12 84:12
3:12,19,20	75:4,4 78:1	55:11 57:13,16	71:17 76:9	today's 54:16,16
23:22 26:21	80:16 81:3	58:14 63:17,23	83:9 95:3	told 18:2 22:1
30:3,12,18	83:6	things 4:19 6:17	three-day 68:15	25:7 27:15
31:11 55:14,15	text 72:5 75:6	6:25 7:17 9:16	throw 15:14	38:16,17,17
55:15 56:19,21	thank 4:7 8:12	14:17 38:15	80:12 89:13	49:9,13 50:16
57:4 58:14	8:13 15:13,17	50:13 53:11	thrown 24:19	51:6,22,25
59:8,24 60:4,8	16:4,6 23:10	54:25 55:1,5,5	tied 47:20	52:11 69:23
62:21 66:10	23:11,13,14	55:9 61:10	time 2:3 3:5,7,7	72:14 78:16,17
86:4 90:6 94:9	31:1,3,4,6,8	62:9 64:8	5:21 8:3,6 9:22	84:23 93:13
L				

. D. 2.16.05.4	20.25.22.25	60 15 71 21	11.14.167.0	1 20.7
toll- 3:16 95:4	20:25 33:25	68:15 71:21	United 67:8	verbatim 30:7
toll-free 3:17	41:12 50:1	74:1,1,2 78:8	69:16	verbiage 53:5
tomorrow's	69:25 82:3	79:6 80:8	universal 13:11	Vermont 57:6
54:17	traumatizing	81:20 83:11	University 89:9	64:14 90:18
ton 82:16	52:25 87:21	type 92:1	unknowingly	versus 36:17
tone 55:18	travel 67:8	types 63:12	32:4	veto 71:9
top 48:12	70:17	U	unnecessary	Vicinanzo 10:3
topic 29:17	treat 4:9 45:8		44:3 53:5	12:16
42:17,18 91:6	61:17	U.S 18:18 29:9	unprotected	victim 2:19 5:3
total 20:8	treated 52:16	29:21 67:9,13	31:24	21:22 22:5
town 19:5 43:18	71:2	89:7	unrepresented	27:7 50:8
traditional	treatment 56:20	ultimate 64:10	59:25	65:24,24 81:21
28:16	75:22	ultimately 17:15	unstoppable	82:3 89:12,16
trafficked 18:19	trenches 60:18	22:24 33:3	45:14	victim's 94:2
trafficking	trespass 24:15	62:6	unsupervised	victimhood
18:18	trial 24:18 27:14	unacceptable	33:4	91:23
tragedy 26:7,7	54:8 71:14	52:2 53:2	unsustainable	victimization
84:14	tried 71:16	unauthorized	21:8	9:23
tragically 75:23	87:16	38:25	unwavering	victims 2:13,18
train 73:8 76:19	triggering 73:1	unbeknownst	32:11	9:4 13:17 14:9
trained 5:5,18	trouble 65:22	67:11	update 86:12	16:21 20:20,25
72:21 89:20	83:17 92:21	uncertain 78:16	90:14	21:3,20 22:20
training 22:17	true 5:12 12:19	uncooperative	updated 9:5	26:5 28:6
27:8 36:13	14:10,19 30:9	69:2	75:24	31:14,20,22
46:18 75:24,24	49:7 65:23	underlying 25:7	uploaded 3:3	35:22 36:1
77:14 78:24	72:11 91:23	understand 30:9	upper 45:17	45:3,10 54:10
90:1	95:11	48:24 58:14	urge 64:2 65:9	54:16,17 59:13
transaction's	truly 87:4	89:18 93:11	66:1	59:19 61:21
6:24	trust 8:10 59:12	understanding	use 7:4 13:3	75:22 80:14
transcript 1:20	trusted 5:10	10:24 18:3	14:15 35:3	91:24
96:3	74:23	37:17 84:9	63:14 76:2	videos 70:1
transcription	truth 10:23 11:4	understatement	89:11	videotaping
1:17,20	22:1	16:25	usually 5:22	40:16
TRANSCRIP	try 30:20 43:12	understood 58:6	77:3 83:19	view 9:11 13:14
96:7	63:10,23 74:11	undertaking	87:3	13:20 15:7
translation	77:21 80:10	33:7	utilities 50:17	19:21 34:1
17:19	trying 4:12	unfair 77:21	utterly 26:12	viewed 88:12
transparency	16:19,23 17:2	unfortunately		violate 11:24
31:19	57:15 72:13	8:24 39:22	V	violated 27:10
transparent	76:2 87:17	47:6,16 94:10	v 28:20 29:18	40:12 48:4
36:12	92:8,21	unfriendly 58:25	vagueness 29:23	violates 11:1
trauma 11:6	turn 22:10	unfunded 21:9	valid 39:7	violation 27:12
20:20,23 34:18	turned 74:5	unhealthy 73:2	value 10:15	48:19
41:24 66:20	turns 19:11 81:8	unhinged 91:22	11:16	violence 1:5 2:7
70:12	twice 25:13 93:9	UNIDENTIFI	valued 37:4	2:12,13,15,16
trauma-infor	two 37:21 41:3	4:1	various 30:17	2:18,18,21
35:6	43:25 48:21	Union 26:1 27:1	34:23 62:17	4:15,20 8:23
traumatic 19:3	51:7 62:9	unique 16:15	vast 58:20	8:23 9:2,5,10
traumatized	66:13,15 67:3	35:9 44:9	vehicle 47:20	12:7 13:14
a aumanzeu	00.13,13 07.3			12.7 13.17
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l	l

15:21 16:22					Page 23
17:8,14 20:13	15.21 16.22		04.22	(0.12.70.14	
21:18,22 22:14, 21,24		_			
22:14,21,24 23:1 24:13 23:1 24:13 23:1 24:13 22:22,23 92:8 22:2,23 92:8 22:2,23 92:8 22:2,23 92:8 22:2,23 92:8 22:2,23 92:8 23:14:10					
23:1 24:13 25:16 26:6.14 27:16 28:18 27:22 23 92:8 want 6:4 8:8,21 11:3 12:5 5:10 21:14 14:11 works 7:9 13:18 35:10,18,25 37:9,20 51:16 58:22 59:2,4 wildfire 43:20 world 34:1 36:6 33:13 4:18 82:20,21 88:14 82:20,21 88:14 83:22 29:18 84:12 87:7 25:3,8 42:9 violence-related 23:4 91:8 94:6 wants 57:13 68:18 69:17,17 visit 68:7,8,13 68:18 69:17,17 visit 68:7,8,13 68:18 69:17,17 visit 68:7,8,13 68:18 69:17,17 visit 68:7,8,13 68:18 69:17,17 vicie 32:1 34:6 volumers 8:6 volumers 8:6 volumers 8:6 volumers 9:18 volumere 8:6 volumers 8:6 volumers 8:6 volumers 8:6 volumers 9:18 volumere 9:18 volumere 9:18 volumere 9:18 volumere 9:18 volumere 9:19 vo					C
25:16 26:6,14 22:22,23 92:8 wart 6:4 8:8,21 vier a 3.7 4:21 vier b 3.7 4:10 vist 64:11 vist 67 visit 68:7.8,13 vinerable 3:610 visit 68:7.8,13 vinerable 3:610 visit 68:7.8 visit 68:7 visit 68:7.8 visit 68:7 visit 68:7.8 visit 68:7.8 visit 68:10 vier b 6:10 visit 68:10 vier b 8:13 vulnerable 3:610 visit 68:7.8 visit 68:10 visit 68:7.8 visit 68:10 visit					
27:16 28:18		0		,	
29:4 31:11,13 31:3 12:5 5:10 21:14 wife 43:19 44:6 53:10,18,25 27:4 35:24 55:3,24 58:11 31:19 60:5 world 34:1 36:6 53:13 44:17 47:5 53:17 57:21 59:11 61:4,20 wildfire 43:20 wilding 59:18 worse 30:25 world 34:1 36:6 53:13 world 34:1 36:6 53:13 world 34:1 36:6 53:13 world 34:1 36:6 53:13 world 34:1 36:6 world 11:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 world 41:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 world 41:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 world 41:15 93:3 80:15 84:23 75:4 76:4 87:8 world 11:15 93:3 80:7 20:2,15 29:5 35:5 80:17,17 68:25 70:16 world 12:1 20:23 90:7,8 world 25:21 world 25:11 xorld 13:13 34:6 world 13:13 34:8 world 13:13 34:18 world 13:13 9:10 20:26 26:8 35:4 yeah 42:14 85:2 92:13 world 13:13 34:18 world 13:13 34:18 world 13:16 36:0 37:0		,			
31:14,20 34:23 35:14 17:3 29:3 52:16 55:3.15 55:3.15 36:14,15 40:23 37:9,20 51:16 55:3,24 58:11 37:9,20 51:16 55:25 59:2,4 wildfire 43:20 wildling 59:18 53:13 31:14 31:16 55:15,17 59:19 60:15 62:4 63:1 74:8,20 77:11 79:13,20 80:6 62:4 63:1 74:8,20 77:11 79:13,20 80:6 wildling 90:6 write 46:11 writing 23:12 50:11 82:22 29:18 64:23 80:15 84:23 write 46:11 writing 23:12 50:11 82:22 29:18 64:23 80:15 84:23 write 46:11 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 writing 23:12 52:23 57:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 writing 23:12 52:23 57:14 writing 23:12 52:23 57:16 writing 23:12 52:23 57:16 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 writing 23:12 52:23 57:14 writing 23:23 writ				_	
35:10,18,25 36:14,15 40:23 37:9,20 51:16 58:22 59:2.4 wildifire 43:20 wi					
36:14,15 40:23 37:9,20 51:16 58:22 59:2,4 wildfire 43:20 44:17 47:5 53:17 57:21 59:11 61:4,20 willing 59:18 worse 30:25 wouldn't 18:16 56:16 58:4 61:13 71:25 61:20,20,21,21 75:16 willing mess 31:18 wrists 76:18 worst 76:18 wrists 76:18 wrists 76:18 wrists 76:18 wrists 76:18 write 46:11 37:28 37:9,20 57:16 61:20,20,21,21 75:16 willing mess 31:18 wrists 76:18 wrists 76:18 wrists 76:18 wrists 76:18 write 46:11 37:28 37:9,20 57:16 of 1:20,20,21,21 of 1:20,20,20,21 of					
44:17 47:5 53:17 57:21 59:11 61:4,20 willing 59:18 worse 30:25 48:2 54:11 60:1,2,17 61:20,20,21,21 75:16 75:16 wouldn't 18:16 59:19 60:15 73:22,25 74:6 65:17 74:10 31:18 writs 76:18 writs 76:18 62:4 63:1 74:8,20 77:11 79:13,20 80:6 wishing 20:6 write 46:11 write 46:11 89:5 wanted 11:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 write 23:12 52:3,8 42:9 we've 6:3,5 70:8,12 78:13 51:23 53:21 violence-related 23:4 91:8 94:6 65:6 78:22 women 19:9 written 24:16 23:23 91:4 wanting 20:6 80:7 word 27:25 wrong 22:10 visia 67:9 62:24 85:17 warm 88:3 71:25 wonderful 24:1 wrong 22:10 visitation 24:6 33:4 waste 28:7 wash't 15:17 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 47:18 95:19 Y'all 73:19 95:9 voluntary 59:18 watched 69:21 watched 69:21 weekend 51:5 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 76:3 77:12 8:21 9:9 yard 6:14,19 48:6 6			,		
48:2 54:11 60:1,2,17 61:20,20,21,21 75:16 wouldn't 18:16 56:16 58:4 61:13 71:25 61:22 65:15,17 willingness 81:22 82:16,17 59:19 60:15 73:22,25 74:6 65:17 74:10 willingness 31:18 wrists 76:18 62:4 63:1 74:8,20 77:11 79:13,20 80:6 wishing 20:6 write 46:11 write 46:11 84:12 87:7 82:20,21 88:14 85:19 90:12 woman 21:21 writing 23:12 89:5 wanted 11:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 writing 23:12 violence-related 50:11 82:22 29:18 64:23 80:15 84:23 momen 19:9 writte 42:16 23:23 91:4 wants 57:13 weapon 6:6 35:5 80:17,17 82:23 90:7,8 wrong 22:10 visit 68:7,8,13 warm 88:3 weshite 3:1,2,3 82:9 wonderful 24:1 xweesciber visit 68:7,8,13 Wasting 28:8 weekend 51:5 weekend 51:5 y'all 73:19 95:9 4visitation 24:6 33:4 watched 69:21 weekend 51:5 weekend 51:5 word 6:9 7:6,7,8 y'all 73:19 95:9 yard 6:			,		
56:16 58:4 61:13 71:25 61:22 65:15,17 willingness 81:22 82:16,17 59:19 60:15 73:22,25 74:6 65:17 74:10 31:18 writes 76:18 62:4 63:1 74:8,20 77:11 80:9 84:11 woeful 91:23 write 46:11 write 46:11 64:11 83:13 78:3 81:18 80:9 84:11 woeful 91:23 write 46:11 write 23:12 52:13 77:10 89:5 wanted 11:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 write 24:16 51:23 53:21 violence-89:19 50:11 82:22 29:18 64:23 80:15 84:23 woman 21:21 xriten 24:16 23:4 91:8 94:6 65: 67 8:22 women 19:9 wrong 22:10 xrong 22:10 <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td>_</td> <td></td>			,	_	
59:19 60:15 73:22,25 74:6 65:17 74:10 31:18 wrists 76:18 62:4 63:1 74:8,20 77:11 79:13,20 80:6 wishing 20:6 writing 23:12 84:12 87:7 82:20,21 88:14 85:19 90:12 woman 21:21 writing 23:12 89:5 wanted 11:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 written 24:16 violence-related 23:4 50:11 82:22 29:18 64:23 80:15 84:23 75:4 76:4 87:8 23:4 91:8 94:6 65:6 78:22 women 19:9 wrong 22:10 violent 22:2 wanting 20:6 80:7 20:2,15 29:5 wrong 22:10 vision 74:10 warm 88:3 warm 88:3 warm 88:3 warm 88:3 80:17 82:23 90:7,8 www.escriber visit 68:7,8,13 68:18 69:17,17 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 wonderful 24:1 1:19 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 websites 5:16 word 57:51 word-of-mouth 43:17 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 wave 45:14 weekend 51:5 weekend 51:5 76:3 word 6:9 7:6,7,8 72:2 8:11 8:6 79:2 8:21 9:9		* *	, , ,		
62:4 63:1 64:11 83:13 74:8,20 77:11 78:3 81:18 79:13,20 80:6 woeful 91:23 woman 21:21 52:13 77:10 woman 21:21 52:13 77:10 witing 23:12 52:13 77:10 woman 21:21 52:13 77:10 witing 23:12 52:13 77:10 woman 21:21 52:13 77:10 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 witing 23:12 52:13 77:10 writing 23:12 52:13 77:13 writing 23:12 52:13 77:13 writing 23:12 52:13 77:10 writing 22:13 52:13 77:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:14 writing 23:12 52:13 77:14 writing 23:13 22:12 52:13 77:14 writing 23:13 22:13 52:13 77:14 writing 22:13 72:13 72:13 72:13 72:13 72:13 72:13 72:13 72:13 72:13 72:13			,	$\overline{\mathcal{C}}$	
64:11 83:13 78:3 81:18 80:9 84:11 woeful 91:23 writing 23:12 89:5 wanted 11:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 written 24:16 violence-89:19 25:3,8 42:9 we've 6:3,5 70:8,12 78:13 51:23 53:21 violence-related 23:4 91:8 94:6 65:6 78:22 women 19:9 wrong 22:10 violent 22:2 wanting 20:6 80:7 20:2,15 29:5 wrong 22:10 23:23 91:4 warrant 49:9 warm 88:3 71:25 wonderful 24:1 68:25 70:16 visit 68:7,8,13 warrant 49:9 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 word 27:25 1:19 visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 waste 28:7 website 5:16 word-of-mouth 43:17 y'all 73:19 95:9 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 Watch 7:17 78:8,12 79:21 word-of-mouth 43:17 y'all 73:19 95:9 voluntary 59:18 watched 69:21 watching 18:8 weekend 51:5 weekend 51:5 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 7:12 8:21 9:9 79:5 80:15 vote 71:9 85:13 way 4:25 5:5 11:7 12:14 13:13 34:18		· ·			
84:12 87:7 82:20,21 88:14 wanted 11:15 85:19 90:12 yoilence-89:19 violence-89:19 yoilence-related 23:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 23:4 85:19 90:12 yoilence-related 23:4 www.eve6:3,5 yoilence-related 23:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 23:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 23:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 23:4 we've 6:3,5 yoilence-related 30:15 84:23 yoilence-related 32:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 32:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 32:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 32:4 we've 6:3,5 yoilence-related 30:15 84:23 yoilence-related 32:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 32:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 32:4 wanted 11:15 yoilence-related 32:4 we've 6:3,5 yoilence-related 30:15 84:23 yoilence-related 40:21 yoile				_	
89:5 wanted 11:15 93:3 22:1 35:14 written 24:16 violence-89:19 violence-related 25:3,8 42:9 we've 6:3,5 70:8,12 78:13 51:23 53:21 23:23 4 91:8 94:6 65:6 78:22 women 19:9 wrong 22:10 violent 22:2 wants 57:13 weapon 6:6 80:7 20:2,15 29:5 wrong 22:10 visa 67:9 62:24 85:17 weapon 6:6 35:5 80:17,17 68:25 70:16 www.escriber visit 68:7,8,13 warrant 49:9 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 word 27:25 X visitation 24:6 33:4 waste 28:7 weskites 5:16 weeksites 5:16 week 3:15 7:14 word-of-mouth 43:17 words 15:11 Y yial 73:19 95:9 yard 6:14,19 Y yard 6:14,19 Y yial 73:19 95:9 yard 6:14,19 Y yard 6:14,19 Y yial 73:19 95:9 yard 6:14,19 Y yard 6:14,19 <					U
violence- 89:19 25:3,8 42:9 we've 6:3,5 70:8,12 78:13 51:23 53:21 violence-related 23:4 91:8 94:6 65:6 78:22 80:15 84:23 75:4 76:4 87:8 violent 22:2 wanting 20:6 80:7 20:2,15 29:5 wrong 22:10 visa 67:9 62:24 85:17 weapon 6:6 35:5 80:17,17 68:25 70:16 visia 67:9 62:24 85:17 warm 88:3 71:25 wonderful 24:1 www.escriber visit 68:7, 8,13 warrant 49:9 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 word 27:25 X visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 websites 5:16 week 3:15 7:14 word-of-mouth 43:17 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 word-of-mouth 43:17 yain 7:20 27:21 76:3 77:12 8:21 9:9 yain 6:14,19 Yazinski 10:12 13:6 56:23 57:11 65:4 yeah 42:14 85:2 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13 92:13	84:12 87:7	82:20,21 88:14	85:19 90:12	woman 21:21	52:13 77:10
violence-related 50:11 82:22 29:18 64:23 80:15 84:23 75:4 76:4 87:8 23:4 91:8 94:6 65:6 78:22 women 19:9 wrong 22:10 23:23 91:4 wants 57:13 weapon 6:6 35:5 80:17,17 68:25 70:16 visia 67:9 62:24 85:17 weaponizing 82:23 90:7,8 www.escriber visit 68:7,8,13 warrant 49:9 wash't 15:17 3:13 22:6 word 27:25 71:22 72:16,18 74:5 75:3 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 X visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 websites 5:16 weck 3:15 7:14 43:17 word-of-mouth 43:17 visita 6:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 weckend 51:5 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 7:12 8:21 9:9 7:12 8:21 9:9 7:12 8:21 9:9 92:13 3:6 6:23 57:11 65:4 92:13 3:6 6:23 57:11 65:4 92:13 3:6 6:23 57:11 68:25 70:16 13:13 3:13 3:18 weeked 51:5 weeked 51:5 word-of-mouth 43:17 92:13 3:6 6:23 57:11 65:4 92:13 3:6 6:23 92:13 3:6 6:23 92:13 3:6 6:23 92:13 3:6 6:23 92:13 3:6 6:23 92:13 3:6 6:23 9		wanted 11:15	93:3	22:1 35:14	written 24:16
23:4	violence- 89:19	25:3,8 42:9	we've 6:3,5	70:8,12 78:13	51:23 53:21
violent 22:2 wanting 20:6 80:7 20:2,15 29:5 wrote 25:11 23:23 91:4 wants 57:13 weapon 6:6 35:5 80:17,17 68:25 70:16 visa 67:9 62:24 85:17 weaponizing 82:23 90:7,8 www.escriber visit 68:7,8,13 warrant 49:9 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 word 27:25 68:18 69:17,17 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 47:18 95:19 Y visitation 24:6 33:4 waste 28:7 websites 5:16 word-of-mouth 43:17 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 words 15:11 17:20 27:21 76:3 voluntary 59:18 watched 69:21 78:8,12 79:21 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 76:3 57:11 65:4 volunteer 8:6 34:8 weekends 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 92:13 volunerable 36:10 11:7 12:14 13:13 34:18 42:1 43:5 weighed 50:6 22:6 26:8 35:4 48:6 61:8 67:4 Wainwright 45:18 49:2,17 welome 95:13 43:21,23 50:18 54:8,89,14,22 94:7 year-old 86:6 wait 74	violence-related	50:11 82:22	29:18 64:23	80:15 84:23	75:4 76:4 87:8
23:23 91:4 visa 67:9 wants 57:13 62:24 85:17 weapon 6:6 weaponizing 35:5 80:17,17 82:23 90:7,8 www.escriber 68:25 70:16 www.escriber vision 74:10 visit 68:7,8,13 68:18 69:17,17 71:22 72:16,18 visitation 24:6 33:4 warrant 49:9 wasn't 15:17 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 47:18 95:19 word-of-mouth 43:17 yard 6:14,19	23:4	91:8 94:6	65:6 78:22	women 19:9	wrong 22:10
visa 67:9 62:24 85:17 weaponizing 82:23 90:7,8 www.escriber vision 74:10 warm 88:3 71:25 wonderful 24:1 1:19 visit 68:7,8,13 warrant 49:9 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 X 68:18 69:17,17 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 47:18 95:19 Y visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 websites 5:16 word-of-mouth 43:17 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 words 15:11 17:20 27:21 76:3 voluntary 59:18 watched 69:21 weekend 51:5 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 7:12 8:21 9:9 72:13 8:21 9:9 volunteer 8:6 34:8 weekend 51:5 weekend 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 79:13 vulnerable 36:10 36:10 11:7 12:14 71:20 20:18 21:8,10 79:5 80:15 Wainwright 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 79:5 80:15 wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 welfare 88:8 59:15 61:10 16:8,21 19:12	violent 22:2	wanting 20:6	80:7	20:2,15 29:5	wrote 25:11
vision 74:10 warm 88:3 71:25 wonderful 24:1 1:19 visit 68:7,8,13 warrant 49:9 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 X 68:18 69:17,17 71:22 72:16,18 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 47:18 95:19 visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 websites 5:16 word-of-mouth 43:17 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 Watch 7:17 week 3:15 7:14 words 15:11 72:20 27:21 voice 32:1 34:6 watched 69:21 watching 18:8 38:23 66:19 76:3 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 75:11 65:4 volunteer 8:6 vote 71:9 85:13 wave 45:14 way 4:25 5:5 weeks 42:8 71:20 15:7,9 17:17 year 39:6 44:13 48:6 61:8 67:4 79:5 80:15 92:13 year 39:6 44:13 48:6 61:8 67:4 79:5 80:15 94:7 year-old 86:6 year-old 86:6 year 5:11 15:20 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12	23:23 91:4	wants 57:13	weapon 6:6	35:5 80:17,17	68:25 70:16
visit 68:7,8,13 warrant 49:9 website 3:1,2,3 82:9 71:22 72:16,18 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 47:18 95:19 visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 websites 5:16 word-of-mouth visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 words 15:11 72:20 27:21 Vivian 37:7 watched 69:21 watched 69:21 weekend 51:5 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 76:3 volunteer 8:6 volunteer 8:6 way 4:25 5:5 weeks 42:8 7:12 8:21 9:9 15:7,9 17:17 way 4:25 5:5 weeks 42:8 71:20 18:7 20:5,9,15 20:18 21:8,10 Wainwright 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 94:7 wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 well- 31:6 59:15 61:10	visa 67:9	62:24 85:17	weaponizing	82:23 90:7,8	www.escriber
Wasn't 15:17 The state of t	vision 74:10	warm 88:3		wonderful 24:1	1:19
Visitation 24:6 33:4 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 visits 6:7 Watch 7:17 voice 32:1 34:6 voluntary 59:18 volunteer 8:6 vote 71:9 85:13 vulnerable	visit 68:7,8,13	warrant 49:9	website 3:1,2,3	82:9	
71:22 72:16,18 43:21 51:13,14 26:25 27:2 47:18 95:19 Y visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 websites 5:16 word-of-mouth 43:17 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 words 15:11 17:20 27:21 yall 73:19 95:9 yard 6:14,19 Yazinski 10:12 13:6 56:23 57:11 65:4 yeah 42:14 85:2 57:11 65:4 yeah 42:14 85:2 92:13 year 39:6 44:13 48:6 61:8 67:4 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15 94:7 79:5 80:15	68:18 69:17,17	wasn't 15:17	3:13 22:6	word 27:25	X
visitation 24:6 74:5 75:3 websites 5:16 word-of-mouth y'all 73:19 95:9 33:4 Waste 28:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 words 15:11 yard 6:14,19 Vivian 37:7 Watch 7:17 38:23 66:19 76:3 yard 6:14,19 voice 32:1 34:6 watched 69:21 weekend 51:5 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 76:3 volunteer 8:6 watching 18:8 34:8 weekends 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 13:6 56:23 volunerable 36:10 11:7 12:14 weeks 42:8 18:7 20:5,9,15 year 39:6 44:13 36:10 11:7 12:14 13:13 34:18 weighed 50:6 22:6 26:8 35:4 year 39:6 44:13 Wainwright 45:18 49:2,17 welfare 88:8 54:8,89,14,22 year 5:11 15:20 wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 welfare 88:8 59:15 61:10 years 5:11 15:20	*	43:21 51:13,14	26:25 27:2		
33:4 waste 28:7 week 3:15 7:14 43:17 y'all 73:19 95:9 visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 Watch 7:17 38:23 66:19 words 15:11 17:20 27:21 Yazinski 10:12 voluntary 59:18 watching 18:8 weekend 51:5 weekends 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 13:6 56:23 57:11 65:4 volunteer 8:6 wave 45:14 weekends 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 15:7,9 17:17 yeah 42:14 85:2 92:13 wulnerable 36:10 11:7 12:14 71:20 20:18 21:8,10 22:6 26:8 35:4 48:6 61:8 67:4 79:5 80:15 94:7 Wainwright 45:18 49:2,17 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 year-old 86:6 year-old 86:6 wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 well- 31:6 59:15 61:10 20:18 21:30 20:18 21:8,10	visitation 24:6	74:5 75:3	websites 5:16	word-of-mouth	
visits 6:7 Wasting 28:8 24:5 37:14 words 15:11 yard 6:14,19 voice 32:1 34:6 watched 69:21 78:8,12 79:21 76:3	33:4	waste 28:7	week 3:15 7:14		-
Vivian 37:7 Watch 7:17 38:23 66:19 17:20 27:21 Yazinski 10:12 voice 32:1 34:6 watched 69:21 78:8,12 79:21 76:3 57:11 65:4 volunteer 8:6 wave 45:14 weekends 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 92:13 vulnerable 36:10 way 4:25 5:5 weeks 42:8 18:7 20:5,9,15 92:13 weighed 50:6 weighed 50:6 22:6 26:8 35:4 48:6 61:8 67:4 Wainwright 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 year 5:11 15:20 wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 welfare 88:8 59:15 61:10 16:8,21 19:12					
voice 32:1 34:6 watched 69:21 78:8,12 79:21 76:3 33:6 56:23 57:11 65:4 57:11 65:4 78:8,12 79:21 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 78:8,12 79:21 78:8,12 79:21 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 78:8,12 79:21 78:8,12 79:21 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 78:8,12 79:21 78:8,12 79:21 78:8,12 79:21 yeah 42:14 85:2 92:13 year 39:6 44:13 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:5 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 79:7 80:15 <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		0			
voluntary 59:18 watching 18:8 weekend 51:5 work 6:9 7:6,7,8 57:11 65:4 volunteer 8:6 34:8 weekends 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 92:13 vulnerable 36:10 11:7 12:14 18:7 20:5,9,15 48:6 61:8 67:4 36:10 11:7 12:14 20:18 21:8,10 48:6 61:8 67:4 Wainwright 42:1 43:5 weighed 50:6 35:8,10,22 94:7 Wainwright 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 year-old 86:6 weifare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 16:8,21 19:12 32:10 24:2 23:10 24:2					
volunteer 8:6 34:8 weekends 68:15 7:12 8:21 9:9 yeah 42:14 85:2 vote 71:9 85:13 way 4:25 5:5 15:7,9 17:17 92:13 weeks 42:8 18:7 20:5,9,15 48:6 61:8 67:4 36:10 11:7 12:14 71:20 20:18 21:8,10 48:6 61:8 67:4 Wainwright 42:1 43:5 weighed 50:6 22:6 26:8 35:4 79:5 80:15 Wainwright 45:18 49:2,17 welcome 95:13 43:21,23 50:18 94:7 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 year 5:11 15:20 wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 well- 31:6 59:15 61:10 23:10 24:2					
wote 71:9 85:13 wave 45:14 74:2 15:7,9 17:17 92:13 vulnerable 36:10 way 4:25 5:5 weeks 42:8 18:7 20:5,9,15 48:6 61:8 67:4 Will 33:13 34:18 weighed 50:6 weighed 50:6 22:6 26:8 35:4 79:5 80:15 Wainwright 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 year old 86:6 weifare 88:8 59:15 61:10 16:8,21 19:12		O			•
vulnerable way 4:25 5:5 weeks 42:8 18:7 20:5,9,15 year 39:6 44:13 36:10 11:7 12:14 71:20 20:18 21:8,10 48:6 61:8 67:4 Wainwright 42:1 43:5 weighted 64:7 35:8,10,22 94:7 Wainwright 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 year-old 86:6 weighted 50:6 59:15 61:10 16:8,21 19:12					
36:10 11:7 12:14 71:20 20:18 21:8,10 48:6 61:8 67:4 W 13:13 34:18 weighed 50:6 22:6 26:8 35:4 79:5 80:15 Wainwright 45:18 49:2,17 welcome 95:13 43:21,23 50:18 94:7 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 year-old 86:6 welfare 88:8 59:15 61:10 16:8,21 19:12				· ·	•
W 13:13 34:18 weighed 50:6 22:6 26:8 35:4 79:5 80:15 Wainwright 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 35:8,10,22 year-old 86:6 weighted 64:7 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 years 5:11 15:20 16:8,21 19:12 16:8,21 19:12					
W 42:1 43:5 weighted 64:7 35:8,10,22 94:7 Wainwright 45:18 49:2,17 welcome 95:13 43:21,23 50:18 year-old 86:6 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 years 5:11 15:20 weighted 64:7 16:8,21 19:12 28:20 59:15 61:10 23:10 24:2					
Wainwright 45:18 49:2,17 welcome 95:13 43:21,23 50:18 year-old 86:6 28:20 49:24 50:9 welfare 88:8 54:8,8,9,14,22 years 5:11 15:20 wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 well- 31:6 59:15 61:10 16:8,21 19:12	\mathbf{W}				
28:20	Wainwright				•
wait 74:2 55:9 57:6 well- 31:6 59:15 61:10 16:8,21 19:12	_	· ·			years 5:11 15:20
33.7 37.0					16:8,21 19:12
	waited 51:16	58:10 59:10	well-being 13:1	62:5 67:20	22:10 24:2
waiting 17:5 60:5 61:19,25 16:11 72:6,25 83:25 34:25 37:22					34:25 37:22
waking 41:25 62:1,11 63:17 went 24:18 39:5 88:24 94:13 38:3,10 39:12		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		,	38:3,10 39:12
walk 57:20 71:2 81:4 41:15,21 44:14 workable 12:11 40:20 43:25					40:20 43:25
69:22 87:11 88:2 50:8 51:6 63:18 47:8,10,24					47:8,10,24
87:11 88:2 30:8 31:0 03:18 48:6,21 54:6,7	~~. <u>~~</u>	07.11 00.4	30.0 31.0	05.10	, ,
			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Page 24

				Page 24
54.9 59.10	17 47.7	275 20.2	2.17	
54:8 58:19	17 47:7	275 20:2	3:17	
63:9 66:15	173 43:16 44:17	3	9	
67:3,14,16	44:25 45:9,16 45:21 46:9	3 10:24 26:22	9 10:24	
70:8 71:17,22		89:3	90 77:3 85:4	
72:3,12,15	173-B 45:8 62:15	3:00 17:2	90-day 44:9	
73:21 74:1,17 75:14 83:10	173-B:1 12:20	3:37 95:24	91-A 30:15	
93:4	27:18	30 10:14,20	95 20:15	
yelling 13:6	17th 80:2	15:20 16:8,21	97 77:3	
70:15	18 19:11 47:10	38:7 53:3	7777.5	
yep 22:7	83:21	70:25		
yep 22.7 yesterday's	19 38:3	30-day 11:18		
54:15	1963 28:21	300 20:2 78:11		
York 29:20	1903 28:21 1988 54:5	3rd 25:3		
	1986 54.5 1990 58:18			
young 32:3,10 youngest 19:11	1770 30.10	4		
83:19,21	2	4 3:18 27:6 30:2		
03.19,21	2 28:22 38:2	54:8		
$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	2,000 24:23	400 39:3,10		
ZINKIN 95:2	20 5:11 15:20	461-A 33:13		
Zoom 68:23	19:12 84:24,25	461-A:6(g)		
	20- 29:21	87:25		
0	20-year 72:18			
0 26:15	20,000 73:23	5		
	2003 54:8	5 28:10		
1	2008 29:19	50 72:20 90:13		
1 30:15 68:3	2010 85:10	90:13		
1:02 2:1	2014 48:9	59 20:4		
10 41:19 47:8	2015 38:2 39:2	6		
48:6 54:7 72:3	2016 23:25			
75:6,13 79:14	41:13 50:6	6 10:24		
81:1	67:2	633 43:1		
100 18:4 20:24	2018 67:9	635 39:1		
21:1 26:14	2019 25:3 50:24	64 20:4		
11 72:3	51:4 68:17	644 38:24		
11/10 41:7	69:20 70:20	7		
11th 58:7	2021 94:7	7 30:1		
12 10:24 11:12	2021-0192 25:14	7227 1:17		
12th 9:15	27:4	ļ		
13 37:23 47:24	2022 1:7 96:15	8		
72:15	207 1:17	8 3:18 30:16		
14 54:6 72:15	21 1:7	8/11 41:13		
15 37:23 41:6,7	21-year-old 10:4	8/21 41:6		
41:8	22 39:12 74:17	8/25 41:7		
15-year-old	23 96:15	800 1:18		
37:23 150.79.11	24-hour 72:22	843 29:22		
150 78:11	24-hours-a-day	85 20:8		
16 77:20 80:14	21:11	85020 1:18		
80:18	257-0885 1:18	855-212-1234		
16th 1:17				
	I	I	ı	I